3107

A CALL TO UNION ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

A

SERMON,

PREACHED AT THE PRIMARY VISITATION OF CHARLES THOMAS, LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

BY

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D.

VICAR OF LEEDS,

AND CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN.

WITH

NOTES AND AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING COPIOUS EXTRACTS FROM THE REFORMERS.

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY.

LONDON: J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

SOLD BY

D. A. TALBOYS, OXFORD; M. ROBINSON, J. CROSS, & J. HARRISON, LEEDS,

AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1838.

[S. PERRING, PRINTER, LEEDS.]

3107

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

CHARLES THOMAS, LORD BISHOP OF RIPON,

HIS RESPECTED AND ESTEEMED DIOCESAN,

AND TO THE REVEREND THE CLERGY WHO ATTENDED THE VISITATION

AT LEEDS,

THIS SERMON,

HONOURED BY THEIR APPROBATION, AND PUBLISHED

AT THEIR REQUEST,

IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED BY THE AUTHOR.

MDCCCXXXVIII.

A

SERMON,

&c.

ACTS, VII. 26.

SIRS, YE ARE BRETHREN; WHY DO YE WRONG ONE TO ANOTHER?

It would be a work of supererogation if, in addressing such a congregation as the present, I were to insist on the important duty incumbent upon all who are commissioned to preach the Gospel, and to act as the governors of the Church of Christ, of maintaining the truth and the whole truth as it is in Jesus—of declaring all the counsel of God. By the injunction of this duty, the highest of our mental faculties and the most vigorous of our intellectual energies are all enlisted on the side of religion, and our lifetime is to be employed either in ascertaining the will of the Almighty or in vindicating his ways to man. But so long as differences shall exist in the capabilities and powers of different minds, it will be scarcely within the circle of possibility to avoid, in the discharge of this duty, some diversity of

opinion, and, in consequence, occasional discussion and debate; nor has it ever been the wish of the Church to silence such discussion or to proscribe all difference of opinion. Coincidence of opinion, even in points which are not fundamental, is, of course, desirable, but it is not to be laid down as one of the necessary terms of communion. It is to a wish and endeavour to secure a perfect coincidence of opinion that we may trace the formation of many religious sects; and on this account it is, that the persons composing each separate sect are comparatively few in number, while the sects themselves have, like meteors, glared for a time and then sunk into nothingness. The system of the Church has, on the contrary, always been to preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, by insisting not on an identity of subordinate opinion, but simply on an identity of principle. Within certain prescribed limits she has always permitted a considerable latitude of opinion. Beyond those limits are the regions of heresy; within them she permits her children piously to inquire and fearlessly to discuss. Unless this latitude were permitted, one of two things would inevitably follow; either all discussion would cease, and the result would be a spiritual stagnation and apathy, than which few things can be more injurious to the cause of truth, or discussion would always lead to a breach of communion and split us into factions and sects. By those who agree in principle, certain data are assumed as indisputable,

and so long as those data are honestly acknowledged, much difference of opinion is allowable, but in either advocating or refuting an opinion under these circumstances no one has a right to speak of his opponent as a heretic, since heresy means, in fact, the denial of the acknowledged data.

Much confusion has been caused in the minds of men by their supposing that the religionists of England are to be divided, so far as principles are concerned, into two classes only, whereas, in point of fact, we are divided into three;—the Churchman, who may, from his avoiding the errors of the two opposite extremes, be called both a Protestant and a Catholic; the Romish Dissenter or Papist; the Protestant Dissenter or Ultra-Protestant. And union among these can never be expected by wise and practical men, until, as distinct classes, two of them become extinct by merging into the third; that is, until their distinct and distinguishing principles cease to exist.

The origin of this threefold division is to be traced to the Reformation, and to the manner in which that great movement was conducted in this country.

No view can be more erroneous than that which would regard the English Reformers as men, who, having devised a peculiar system of theology, were determined to supplant the established system that they might put their own in its place. Their object was simple, intelligible,

and practical: it was to correct abuses in the existing Catholic Church, which had come down to them from their ancestors, and of which they were themselves the bishops and spiritual pastors. Those abuses,—deviations from the real principles of the Church,—were gradually discovered, and, as from time to time they were brought to light, it was the endeavour of our Reformers gradually, and as opportunity occurred to supply a remedy by regular and canonical means. From the commencement to the conclusion of their holy work, they indignantly repudiated the idea of their wish to overturn one Church and to establish another; a charge continually brought against them by the advocates of Popery. For example, in the reign of Henry VIII. it was enacted that neither the King, his successors, nor his subjects should apply to the Bishop of Rome for any dispensation, faculty, or delegacy. This was the first blow at the Papal usurpations in this country: but, anticipating the kind of attack which would be made by the partizans of Rome, and to prevent misconstruction and misrepresentation, it is expressly provided that "nothing in this act shall be interpreted as if the King and his subjects intended to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in any thing concerning the very articles of the *Catholic* faith* in Christendom, or in any other things declared by Holy Scripture and the Word of God necessary for their sal-

* Note A.

vation."[1] In the orders for regulating the pulpit, in 1535, the clergy are directed to pray for the Catholic Church of Christ, and of this our Catholic Church of England our Sovereign Lord King Henry VIII. is declared to be immediately under God the supreme head.[2] And Tonstal, in his Letter to Cardinal Pole, explains very clearly the intention which at this period of the Reformation existed: "To the charge," he says, "of the King's departing from the *Catholic* communion, his Highness is much injured by the imputation; for it has all along been his practice to adhere to the unity of the *Catholic* Church, to maintain the ancient doctrine, and to conform to the worship and ecclesiastical government of the rest of Christendom." "It is true," he continues, "that he has rescued the English Church from the encroachments of the Court of Rome, but if this be singularity, he deserves commendation, for the King has only reduced matters to their *original* state, and helped the English Church to her ancient freedom."[3] At the trial of Lambert, in 1538, the Reformation had considerably advanced, but still on the same principles; for Day, Bishop of Chichester, in the speech by which the trial was opened, observed that the King had thrown off the usurpations of the See of Rome, discharged some idle monks, renounced the idolatrous regard for images, published the Bible in English, and made

[1] Collier, Eccles. Hist. ii. 84. 85. [2] Collier, ii. 100.
[3] Collier, Eccles. Hist. ii. 136.

some lesser alterations in the Church, but that he was nevertheless resolved to keep constant to the *Catholic faith and custom.*[4] And in the spring of 1543, the act for the advancement of true religion and the abolishment of the contrary, declared it to be expedient to "ordain and establish a certain form of pure and sincere teaching, agreeable to God's word and the true doctrine *of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.*"*

The facts here stated are sufficient to shew that the holy work of Church Reformation, if gradual, had still been great and effectual even in Henry's reign; in that of Edward, our Reformers proceeded more rapidly and did some things, perhaps, inconsiderately, but still the same principle was professed. In his speech at the opening of the Convocation we find the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer, exhorting the Clergy to advance further in the Reformation,—but how? by throwing off some *unprimitive* remains.[5] And by the statute of 1547, which sanctioned the giving of the Eucharist in both kinds, a reference is made, in justification of the proceeding, to the common use and practice both of the Apostles and *of the primitive Christians by the space of* 500 *years.*[6] In the King's injunction against images, it is stated as a reason that "the Catholic Church made use of no representations of this kind for many years."[7] In the Act of Uniformity, after alluding to the

* Collier, ii. 151. * Jenkyn's Cranmer, i. 36. [5] Collier, ii. 233.
[6] Collier, ii. 236. [7] Collier, ii. 241.

various Rituals and Liturgies at that time used in England, it is affirmed that his Majesty appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, with several others of the most learned Bishops and Divines, to draw up an office for all parts of divine service, and that in doing so they were to have regard to the directions of the Holy Scripture *and the usages of the primitive Church.*[8] In reply to the demands of the Devonshire rebels, Archbishop Cranmer, acting authoritatively, particularly insisted to them "that the practice and belief of the Church of England was agreeable *to the decisions of the general councils*, while the decrees they (the rebels) talked of were mere stretches of the Court of Rome to enslave the rest of Christendom."[9] Again, in the answer of the King's Council to the Princess, afterwards Queen Mary, in 1551, penned most probably by the Archbishop of Canterbury and by Ridley Bishop of London, it is averred, "that the English Reformation had recovered the worship to the directions of Scripture, and the *usage of the primitive Church.*"[10] And when the Prayer Book was translated and corrected and brought to its present form, it was recommended by the Clergy to the laity in these words: "Here you have an order of Prayer, and for the reading of Scripture, *much agreeable to the mind and purposes of the old fathers:*"* and as such it was received by the laity; it was received as "a very

[8] Collier, ii. 263. [9] Collier, ii. 271. [10] Collier, ii. 311.
* Preface to the Prayer Book.

godly order agreeable to the word of God *and the primitive Church.*"[11] In Queen Mary's reign Cranmer offered to justify the English Communion Service both from the authority of Scripture *and* the practice of the primitive Church.[12] What indeed was his defence of our Communion Service? What his objection to the Mass? Of the first he asserted, "it is conformable to the order which our Saviour Christ did observe and command to be observed, and which his Apostles and *the primitive Church* used many years; whereas the Mass in many things hath not only no foundation of Christ's Apostles *or the primitive Church*, but is manifestly contrary to the same, and containeth many horrible abuses in it." "And when they, the Papists, boast of the faith which has been in the Church these thousand years, we will join them on this point: for *that doctrine and usage is to be followed which was in the Church fifteen hundred years past.* And we shall prove that the order of the Church set out at this present by act of Parliament is the same that was used in the Church fifteen hundred years past. And so shall they never be able to prove theirs."* In like manner the imprisoned clergy, in that reign of terror, made a similar but more extensive offer to justify the reformed doctrine and worship by scripture *and antiquity*, and this under the highest penalties.

[11] Collier, ii. 320. [12] Collier, ii. 347.

* Archbishop Cranmer's "Declaration concerning the Mass." Works, IV, p. 2, 3. Jenkyn's Edit.

Their expressions, indeed, are as striking as they are strong—"If they failed in maintaining the homilies and service set forth in the late reign, or in proving the unlawfulness of the popish liturgic forms, and that *by Catholic principles and authority*, they were willing to be burnt at the stake, or to submit to any other death of ignominy or torture."[13] On the accession of Elizabeth in 1559, a public and authorised disputation was held between the abettors of Popery and the upholders of a Reformation. On the side of the Reformers the most prominent was Horne, Dean of Durham, and he commenced by professing at once the deference which his friends acknowledged to be due to the authority of the Catholic Church, declaring the willingness of the English Reformers to refer the whole controversy to the Holy Scriptures *and the Catholic Church*, but maintaining at the same time that by the Word of God they meant only the canonical Scriptures, and by the custom of the primitive Church, the general practice of Catholics for the first five centuries.[14] In the same sentiment did the laity concur, when in a subsequent act of Parliament the authority of the first four general Councils was recognized.[15] We have heard already the declaration of one sovereign at the commencement of our Reformation, that it was not intended to set up a new

[13] Collier, ii. 378.

[14] Coll. ii. 416. Conf. Strype's Annals, Appendix, 1465. Burnet's Records, ii. 474.

[15] 1. Eliz. c. 1. sec. 36, A.D. 1558.

religion, but merely to correct abuses in the Church,—and precisely the same assertion was made, at its completion, by Queen Elizabeth. In her reply to the Roman Catholic Princes she proclaimed "that there was no new faith propagated in England; no religion set up but that which was commanded by our Saviour, *practised by the primitive Church, and approved by the Fathers of the best antiquity.*"[16] Moreover, the very convocation of 1571, which originally enjoined subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, confirmed, at the same time, the principle of the English Reformation, by decreeing that nothing should be taught as an article of faith, except what is supported by the authority of Scripture and catholic tradition,[17] which principle is again authoritatively proclaimed in our 30th Canon, wherein it is affirmed that "it was not the purpose of the Church of England to forsake or reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in *all* things which they held and practised, and that therefore it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God or offend the minds of sober men;—and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders."*

[16] Coll. ii. 436.

[17] Can. de Concionatoribus. Wilkins' Concilia, iv. 267.

* Canon 30. See note B.

I shall not detain you by pointing out how that principle was still avowed and acted on when, in the reigns of James I. and Charles II., some further reformations were effected in our Church, but I proceed to shew how another principle was introduced among the English Protestants.

The foreign Reformers were not placed under the same advantageous circumstances as favored the proceedings of those who conducted the reformation of the English Church. They were not generally the rulers and governors of their respective churches. As abuses were discovered they protested against them, they called for reform, yet had no wish or intention to separate. But in most of the foreign churches, the Bishops, instead of correcting, defended the corruptions, and in process of time the anti-reformation party succeeded in driving from their communion the friends of a Reformation. Thus the Protestants were obliged, by circumstances, to form for themselves separate and independent religious communions. But in doing so they devised no regular system, for they seem to have regarded the measure to which they were compelled, as one of only a temporary nature, and having solemnly appealed to a general council, they hoped that the time would come when the Western Church would reform itself and receive once again into its bosom those whom it had unjustly expelled for advocating

its true principles.* But it was not long before, among the less enlightened friends of the Reformation, a spirit of fanaticism was excited; and acting, like the man who continued to whet and whet his knife until at last there was no steel left in it, they wished to abscind every ordinance, phraseology, and doctrine which might seem to connect them even indirectly with Rome, and desired new ceremonies, a new system of theology, a new theological vocabulary, a new Church. And they were not long without a leader in a man of vast mental powers and of ardent piety, but of an austere temper and strong personal ambition, John Calvin. Instead of comparing, like our own Reformers and the early Protestants of Germany, the existing system of theology with Holy Writ and the traditional doctrine of the early Church, he invented an entirely new system of his own, to which, with more than papal intolerance, he called for a prostration of the judgment, and he proceeded to the length of shedding human blood to support it. Instead of seeking to reform the Church, he was ambitious to build up a sect which might serve as a model to all other religious communions, and over which he seemed willing to usurp such authority as to render it doubtful whether he did not intend to divert to Geneva the appeals which had been formerly made to Rome.

* Note C.

When the persecutions of Queen Mary's reign drove so many of the English abroad, there were some of our countrymen who, first at Frankfort and afterwards at Geneva, were prepared to decry the English Reformation for not having proceeded far enough, and to embrace the foreign system of the Swiss sect.* By Calvin our Prayer Book was denounced as containing fooleries, only tolerable from the exigency of the times, and it was determined to supply its place by a ritual less accordant with the ancient form of worship, and more conformable to the Genevan model. Instead of coinciding with our English Catholic reformers in their deference to antiquity, they referred, when Scripture was ambiguous or doubtful, to the writings of Calvin, and regarded as heretical all who refused to receive his dogmas as truth.

And thus when the persecuted Protestants† returned to England, on the accession of Elizabeth, the English Church was composed of three distinct parties, all animated by distinct principles: those who wished not to adopt any foreign system of theology, but merely to complete the Reformation of their ancient national Church, by doing what was absolutely necessary for the purpose, and nothing more; those who were enamoured of the Helvetic Reformation, and complained that our reformers had not gone far enough: and those who, complaining that they had gone too far, were adverse to the Reformation altogether.

* Note D. † Note E.

Many and bitter were the disputes that arose, and it was not long before the bolder and more consistent of the followers of Calvin separated from the Church, which they regarded as *semi-papistical*, and formed independent conventicles. As persons assuming to be the supporters of a purer system of Reformation than that which had been adopted by our English Reformers, they were known by the designation of Puritans.* Their example was soon after followed by those of the opposite extreme, who were the advocates of the discarded corruptions. These persons entered clandestinely into a correspondence with the Pope of Rome, who sent some Spanish and Italian Priests to officiate among them; and adopting another foreign system, that established at the Council of Trent, they formed that schismatical sect from which the present English Romanists or Papists are descended.†

This is a short sketch of the origin of those three distinct classes of Christians, subject, of course, to a variety of subdivisions, which we find in this country. But although the bolder, more consistent, and perhaps more conscientious of the Puritans quitted the Church, a large party who embraced their principles still conformed, some from

* The name was probably given to them, in the first instance, as a nick-name, by their opponents, and they afterwards gloried in it, and so assumed it to themselves. In a puritan libel, A.D. 1574, "A Letter of Robert Johnson to Goodman, Dean of Westminster," he calls the Dean "*a Papist*, a Schismatic, and a PURITANE," printing the last word in capitals, as if it was a term of reproach, which he retorted.

† Note F.

timidity, some from worldy considerations, and some because they thought that the Church of England, being only comparatively corrupt, *i. e.* less pure than some of the foreign sects, they were not obliged to secede, and might eventually cause their own principles to triumph in the Church itself. These persons, assisted by the Puritans from without, were continually urging our Rulers, spiritual and temporal, to greater measures of reform; and, complaining of the remnants and rags of Popery still preserved in our rites, ceremonies, and ecclesiastical habits, they "inveighed against the established discipline of the Church, and accounted every thing from Rome which was not from Geneva."*

A contest between parties disagreeing in principle is always a contest of life and death, a war of extermination,—for principles may be broken, but can never be bent—may be silenced but can never yield. And so was it with the Protestants of England. The contest was whether the country should adhere to the principles of the English or to those of the foreign Reformers, and the war was carried on unremittingly from the accession of Elizabeth to the fatal termination of the reign of Charles, who died a martyr for the principles of the English Reformation, or (which is the same thing) for the principles of the Catholic Church. During the great rebellion the advocates of the foreign system

* Note G.

triumphed, and the Church, with the Crown, was laid prostrate in the dust. But at that period a modification of their principle was introduced among those who, in opposing the system of English Reformation, had till then been united. Hitherto the question had been whether the Bible was to be received according to the interpretation of the ancient Church, or according to the interpretation of the Genevan Sect. But when the descendants of the original Puritans endeavoured to force their system upon the country as the one to be exclusively established, they in their turn were opposed by founders of new sects who regarded their own interpretations of Scripture to be as irrefragable as that of Calvin. It was then, and under such circumstances, that the real ultra-protestant principle, which has ever since prevailed, as contrasted with the principles of the Church of England, was brought to light;—that principle being not merely that the Bible and the Bible only ought to be our religion, but also that the Bible is to be understood by each person in that sense which he is persuaded by argument to regard as the true sense; and that he is then to unite himself with that society of Christians with whom the same or similar arguments have been productive of the same effect. This principle is, of course, subversive of union. For on these grounds the only difference between the coldest Socinian who acknowledges the truth of Scripture, and the highest supra-lapsarian Calvinist, is a

difference in their logic or their powers of biblical criticism,—and while both parties may argue, neither may consistently censure. And thus the ultra-protestant party gradually split into various hostile factions, and their divisions led eventually to the restitution of the Church with the restoration of the Monarchy.*

At the same time a change took place in the *policy* of the Dissenters from the Church. The attempt had been to supplant the Church and to supply her place by the establishment of the Genevan system. The experiment was made and it had failed. And the demand was now, for what they had themselves, in times past, vehemently protested against,—a civil toleration. They asked for themselves that toleration which, when dominant,† they refused to extend to the Church, and a toleration was obtained;—a toleration which, just in itself, has been peculiarly advantageous to the Church; for it has enabled her to do what before she was unable to do—without breach of charity to insist upon the observance of her principles, and to proclaim the most unwelcome truths; it has introduced that *moral* discipline among us which no external powers could enforce. In vain did our Reformers appeal to the strong arm of the law, to compel that conformity to the regulations of the Church, which is now rendered, according to the best of his understanding and ability, by every clergyman of common honesty

* Note II. † Note I.

and honor: the Church is now able to say, without any spirit of persecution, "assent to my fundamental doctrines, and adhere to my internal regulations, or depart from my communion. However blameworthy I may think your conduct, for such a departure, you are no longer subjected to temporal penalties, and, therefore, as a man not merely of religion but of honor, depart."*

Our principle is thus reduced within a very narrow compass, intelligible to the least enlightened mind. Every conscientious English Clergyman acts on the principle that while Scripture and Scripture only is his rule of faith, he is, in the interpretation of Scripture, to defer to the Ritual, Liturgy, Articles, and Formularies of the Church of England: he is to promote the glory of God in the highest, peace upon earth and good will among men, but to do so, not in the way which he may imagine to be the wisest, but according to the Regulations, Canons, Rubrics, Customs, of the Church. To these he is bound by vows the most solemn to conform.

And where are we to look for unity and union, if we find it not here? And what terms of reprobation can be sufficiently strong to designate the conduct of those who, by causing discord among brethren who in principle are united, would thereby make music for our enemies? Alas! in every community such persons are found to exist, whose element is strife, who live by faction, who,

* Note K.

mistaking party spirit for Christian zeal, in their contest for what they allege to be truth, forget that Christianity is also a religion of Peace and Love. At the present time such persons are busy among ourselves; they avow their wish to prevent a union among the Clergy; in the bitterness of their spirit they conceive that the cause of Truth can only be supported by the formation of hostile confederacies within the Church; they glory in their unholy endeavours to arm brother against brother, and in the hope of waging a worse than civil war with the deadly weapons of theological hatred. Few in number, they would scarcely be deserving of notice, if, by anonymous misrepresentations which ought never to be credited until they have been fully examined, and by exaggerations which from their very absurdity ought to excite the scepticism of charity, they had not partially succeeded in inflaming the passions and exciting the prejudices of many good and zealous, but ill-judging and mistaken men, who, instead of regarding measures, respect persons; who confound opinions with principles, and, in their attachment to phrases, forget the truth of things.

Now, such being the case, let us rip open the apple of discord which the enemies of peace would throw among us and see what it actually contains; let us briefly advert to the subjects most freely discussed among us, and sure I am that when we perceive how the case really stands, all moderate men, all who are not far gone in party spleen, will

be ready to admit, that, if in opinion upon several points we may some of us differ, there can be no just ground,—I do not say for the rancour which is sometimes exhibited in these discussions, for this can under no circumstances be justifiable,—but for the disturbance of that unanimity and christian harmony, by the existence of which we are commanded to give proof that we are the Disciples of the Prince of Peace.

Let us take, in the first place, the subject of Tradition, and only assume in charity that the disputants on both sides are in their intention honest and conscientious Churchmen, men, that is to say, desirous of holding opinions in conformity with the principles of the English Church.

On the two great points which involve our common principle we are all agreed. We all of us hold, on the one hand, "that holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation";* and we all of us hold, on the other hand, that in all cases of difficulty or doubt we are to take for our guide the Ritual, Liturgy, Articles, and Formularies of the Church of England. But here we are met by those who impugn our principle of interpretation, the Dissenters, whether Romish or Protestant, who very fairly demand

* Article vi.

why more of deference should be paid to the English Church than to any of their own sects; to the English than to the foreign reformers; to Cranmer, Ridley, and Parker, than to Zuinglius, Calvin, or Beza: to this objection other answers may be given, but I only know of one which is of any weight, and which has always been adduced ever since the Reformation by all the divines who have adhered to the principles of the English reformers.* Looking to the principles upon which the Reformation of the Church of England was conducted, to the strict regard our reformers paid to the voice of antiquity, to their avowed determination to adhere to the unquestioned and unquestionable tradition of doctrine universally received, they contend, and affirm their readiness to prove, that in our Ritual, Liturgy, Articles and Formularies, is embodied all that is essential of the traditional doctrine of the universal Church; and that, therefore, in deferring to them, we defer not to the decision of a few individuals, but to the tradition universally received in those early ages when, on all subjects relating to doctrine or to discipline, a strict correspondence was kept up

* To those who are desirous of seeing how invariably this rule has been observed by our great standard writers, I may recommend "The Judgment of the Anglican Church, posterior to the Reformation, on the sufficiency of the Holy Scripture and the authority of the Holy Catholic Church, in matters of faith, by John F. Russell, B.C.L. of St. Peter's College, Cambridge" See also the incomparable Appendix to Bishop Jebb's Sermons; Churton's "Church of England a Witness and Keeper of the Catholic Tradition;" Poole's very learned Sermons on the Creed; an admirable Discourse on Tradition, by Mr. Cartwright, Minister of the Jews' Episcopal Chapel; and Keble's Visitation Sermon.

between all the branches of the Church universal. And this tradition they regard, not as the Romanists regard their falsified traditions, as supplementary to Scripture, as conveying doctrines which are not contained in Scripture (for they subscribe to the 6th of our articles), but merely as confirmatory of the true meaning of Scripture, whenever Scripture is ambiguous or doubtful. Now this is, very possibly, in the minds of some, a bad answer to the Dissenter, an untenable defence, and any one has a perfect right to supply us with a better if he can. But surely there is no ground for division. no ground here for our splitting into parties and factions, no ground for those fears which the wicked would suggest, and by which the weak are irritated. If those who contend for the authority of tradition contend at the same time that all necessary tradition is preserved in our Church, the very summit of their offending, so far as those who are *in* the Church are concerned, can only be an error in judgment, a mistake in opinion. By all parties within the pale, the same *principle* is recognized and acted upon; and the real debate is with those who are *without* the pale, who ridicule, as inconsistent and ridiculous, the deference which all clergymen acknowledge themselves bound to pay to the authoritative documents of the Church of England.

So again with respect to the Sacraments.* On this subject all must admit that the language of the

* Note L.

Church of England is peculiarly strong. In her holy jealousy for the two divine ordinances of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, she withholds the title of Sacrament, in the sense she applies it to them, from all other religious rites, however sacred, however apostolical in their institution, however much the subordinate means of grace. She declares the Sacraments to be generally necessary to salvation, and she defines a Sacrament thus necessary to salvation, as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof"—a means to convey grace, a pledge to assure the worthy recipient of its illation. Of Baptism she states the inward grace, of which it is the means, to be "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness."* She quotes the 3rd chapter of St. John,† in which the necessity of

* There is a very strong single proof of the doctrine of the Church of England on Baptism, pointed out by the present learned and pious Bishop of Bangor, that in Article IX. where the English is, "there is no condemnation to them that believe and are *baptized*," the Latin runs, "*renatis* et credentibus."

† Bishop Kaye, in his Tertullian, p. 483, observes that the ancients *uniformly* interpreted our Lord's address, in this chapter, to Nicodemus, as relating to Baptism. This is also shewn by Wall, in his History of Infant Baptism. Bishop Beveridge, as quoted by Bishop Mant, observes, "What Christ means of being born of Water and of the Spirit, is *now* made a question: I say *now*, for it was never made so till of late years. For many ages together none ever doubted it, but the whole Christian world took it for granted that our Saviour meant only by these words, that except a man be baptized according to his institution, he cannot enter the kingdom of God: this being the most plain and obvious sense of the words, forasmuch as there is none other way of being born again of Water as well as of the Spirit, but only in the Sacrament of Baptism."—*Bishop Beveridge's Works*, i. 304.

a *new birth* is asserted, as a chapter implying, on *that account*, "the great necessity of Baptism where it can be had;"* in the Baptismal offices she expressly connects the regeneration of infants always, and of adults duly qualified, with Baptism; in the office for Confirmation she does the same; in the Homilies the Font is designated as "the Fountain of our Regeneration,"† while it is insinuated that by Baptism we are justified;‡ and she teaches our children in the Catechism that they were at Baptism made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of heaven. With reference to the other sacrament she asserts that the body of Christ is "given, taken, received, and eaten in the Supper";§ the Eucharist itself she styles the Communion, (that is, the communication), of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour.‖ And we are told that those who are duly qualified spiritually eat therein the flesh of Christ and drink his blood.¶ We are directed when we receive the Eucharist to pray God to grant that we may "*so* eat the flesh of his dear son Jesus Christ and drink his blood that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood;"** and "that receiving the creatures of

* Office for Adult Baptism.

† Homily for Repairing and Keeping Clean of Churches. See also Homily on Fasting.

‡ "After that we are baptized or justified."—*3rd Part of Homily on Salvation.*

§ Article xxviii. ‖ Exhortat. Communion Office. ¶ Ibid.

** Prayer of Humble Access.

bread and wine we may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood."* And after communicating we thank God for that he doth "vouchsafe to feed us with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."† In the catechism mention is made of the "outward and visible *form*" of a sacrament, and in the homilies we find an allusion to our "receiving our Lord's most blessed body and blood under the *form* of bread and wine";‡ and in the homilies we are also exhorted to hold that "in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent";§ and we are told that the faithful "receive not only the outward sacrament, but the spiritual thing also, not the figure but the truth, not the shadow but the body";‖ finally, our children are taught that the inward part of the Eucharist is, "the body and blood of Christ which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."¶ Now these expressions are so strong that many pious and well-meaning men have regarded them as sufficient to justify their secession from our communion; while more violent controversialists have not hesitated to denounce the English Church for retaining them, as semi-popish, if not absolutely papistical. They both censure our baptismal office, and affirm that our

* Consecration Prayer. † Post. Communion.
‡ Advertisement at the end of the First Book of Homilies.
§ Hom. xxviii. ‖ Ibid. ¶ Catechism.

doctrine of the Eucharist differs little, if at all, from the transubstantiation of the Romanist, or, at all events, from the consubstantiation of the Lutheran,—dogmas equally unphilosophical and unscriptural. The English Churchman, then, is here placed on the defensive, and the defence is conducted in two ways. Some persons admit (without questioning) the accuracy of our opponents in their notions of sacramental efficacy; and, seeing the manifest and glaring inconsistency between our services and those notions, regret that our reformers retained the expressions objected to, but at the same time contend that they do not of necessity bear the construction which is generally placed on them, but admit of a restricted meaning, more conformable with the view of the objector. Others there are who receive these expressions in all the simplicity and fulness of their meaning, and thinking that they are amply borne out by Scripture, maintain that the English reformers, in the retention of them, used a wise discretion, and acted consistently on those Catholic principles to which they professed to adhere. These assume the offensive against our common objectors, and shew that, in confounding, as do the foreign reformers, regeneration with renovation,—a change of spiritual state, circumstances, and relations, and an election to grace, with a subsequent change of disposition, heart, and temper,—the objectors are themselves in error; and are equally unscriptural in the very low notions they entertain of the grace

conveyed to the faithful in the other sacrament. And thus, since no one but a man equally void of integrity, and regardless of the sanctity of an oath, would presume to alter our baptismal office or the Liturgy, to make them square with his private views; the only question among Churchmen is whether the words we use in common will, or will not, by fair construction, bear the interpretation which some persons put upon them. If, after fair discussion, it is found they cannot,—of course those who think that the expressions used in our offices are anti-scriptural will quit our communion, and the discussion will then be one relating to principle, and the debate will be as to the meaning of the words of scripture. Until it comes to this,—our differences of opinion ought surely not to lead to disunion among ourselves.

Come we now to the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession. On this subject no controversy existed at the time of the Reformation. It was, at that time, as it had been for 1500 years, taken for granted, that no man might presume to minister in sacred things, unless he were first appointed to the office by persons having authority to make the appointment by their regular succession from the apostles. Upon this point no one is more eloquent or more decided than our own reforming Archbishop, Dr. Cranmer.* Accordingly, when in the reign of Elizabeth the Thirty-nine Articles were agreed upon in a convocation of our clergy, the

* Note M.

doctrine was assumed: "it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or administering the Sacraments in the congregation before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them *in*"—not *by*, but *in*—"the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."* But the point being settled that there *are* some persons *in* the congregation or Church who have powers to ordain, the question is who those persons are? This was the question in debate at the Reformation, and it is easily answered so far as the Church of England is concerned, since it was settled, before the Thirty-nine Articles were received, in the ordinal, in which it is affirmed: "It is evident to all men diligently *reading the Scriptures and ancient authors*, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."† In the order for consecrating Bishops, as well as in the Ordination Service, she speaks of the offices of Priests and Deacons as offices *divinely* instituted; and, if instituted by God, of course they cannot be lawfully abolished. But it is a point not controverted, that wherever these officers exist, the power of ordination rests with the first, assisted by the second. And accordingly, in legislating on

* Article xxiii. † Pref. to the Ordinal.

BIBLIOTHECA PUSEIANA, OXON.

this subject, the Church of England ordains that "no one shall be accounted and taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, among us, or be suffered to execute any of the ministerial functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to our form of episcopal ordination, *or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination.*"* A more complete answer to the question, who are they that have authority in the congregation, could not be given by a Church which reverences Scripture *and the ancient authors*. And hence it is, that while a Minister of the Roman Church officiates among us, upon the renunciation of his errors, without a further ordination, a converted Presbyterian Minister is unable to do so. The one has had, the other has not had, episcopal ordination.

Now this regulation very naturally offends the various self-appointed ministers and teachers who have, of late years, abounded in the land. They accuse the Church of intolerance, bigotry, and illiberality, since they conclude that she implies, by this regulation, the invalidity of all but episcopal ordination; and in this conclusion they are the rather confirmed when they find our Canons denouncing, as *ipso facto* excommunicated, not only those who affirm that the Church of England is not a true and apostolical Church,† or that the form of God's worship in the Church of England is corrupt,‡ but also those who, not being of the Church of England, challenge to

* Pref. to Ordinal. † Can. ii. ‡ Can. iv.

themselves in England the name of true and lawful Churches.* Under such a reproach some of the members of our Church are impatient, and deny that the conclusion must of necessity be drawn. Others, rejoicing in every thing to bear the scandal of the cross, admit the justness of the conclusion, but contend that the Church is no more to be blamed for this than a mirror for the wrinkles or deformities it may bring to view. The Church injures no one by asserting the fact, for, if it *be* a fact, a fact it is whether she asserts it or not. It either is a fact that a society of believers, organized without the episcopal order, is not a Church, but merely a sect not organized according to apostolical and scriptural rule, as our Church insinuates, or it is not a fact. It is open to discussion whether it be a fact; there is no want of charity in our declaring what we believe to be such. As maintainers of God's truth we are to declare it in this as in every other instance, and in God's good time the truth will be known and recognized, and those who have deserted it will perceive that Christian unity is to be restored, not by *our* yielding to *them*, but by *their* returning to *us*. As we may preach that faith in the Lord Jesus is necessary to salvation, without denying the salvability of the heathen; so none will refuse to admire and reverence and love the pious and consistent Christian of every communion, whether Romish or Protestant; none—God forbid,—will doubt of his being capable of salvation, though we may still

* Can. xi.

believe that in many respects he may have fallen short of gospel truth. But be this as it may—it is a principle to be discussed with those who are in principle separated from us,—it is certainly no just cause of angry dispute among ourselves, who have declared our unfeigned assent and consent not only to our Articles, but to our ordination offices,—the first of which declare that those only may minister in sacred things who are duly ordained, and the second that those only are to be considered by us as duly ordained who have received episcopal orders. The only legitimate subject of discussion among *us* is, how are we to meet the objection to our principle as urged by Dissenters—a mere matter of opinion, not a fair plea for division.

I will only advert to one point more, and then hasten to a conclusion. I allude now to the angry debates which contentious men would raise among us with reference to the Ceremonies of the Church. On this subject, too, we are in principle united. We all agree that forms and ceremonies are in themselves things indifferent, unless they have been divinely prescribed, as in the case of the Sacraments, and some of the Sacramentals. We are all of us also agreed in admitting that when we have solemnly vowed as bishops, priests, and deacons of the Church of England to adhere to the forms and ceremonies, rubrics, usages, and regulations of the Church of England, these ceremonies, relatively to us, cease to be things indifferent. If we make a vow, we are, of course, bound to keep it, and they, therefore, if such there

be, who think that they shew their wisdom by a studied disregard of the decent ceremonies of the Church, do, in reality, only shew the little respect they have for their declarations and oaths. But it is notorious, from whatever circumstances, that, since the reformation, the ceremonies of the Church of England have been, in several respects, altered, either by the introduction of new practices, or by the neglect of old ones. For example, we find that metrical Psalms are now sung as a regular part of our service, of which they originally formed no portion.* This innovation is one of ancient date, and I am not complaining of it, but still it *is* an innovation, and like most innovations it has gradually led to another of a very questionable character; I allude to the introduction of unauthorized hymns of human composition. Another innovation since the time of our reformers is the use of extempore prayer before or after the sermon. Now these are very serious innovations, since they afford to an individual minister more liberty than the Church allows, and enable him to blend his private opinions with the acknowledged principles of the Church in such a manner as to confound the one with the other. Many other innovations of minor importance might easily be pointed out, such as the prevailing practice for the minister to turn in prayer *to* the people:† in the days of the reformers, and for some time after, the minister turned *from* the people in prayer, *to* them in exhortation, so that

* Note N. † Note O.

even by his action the people could distinguish between his address *to* them, and his address *for* them and *with* them to God:—they were continually reminded, by outward circumstances, of the holy duty in which they ought to be engaged. The innovation in this respect has likewise led to another, in that unsightly novelty a second pulpit, which is now adopted in some sanctuaries, instead of the ancient fald-stool or low desk.* Among omissions, we may note that the people (in consequence, perhaps, of the former innovation,) too generally sit instead of kneel at prayer, and seldom bow at the name of the Lord Jesus;† while in some places we find that the clergy no longer say the Communion Service standing at the communion table, and the table is deprived of the candlesticks with which it is directed that it should be adorned.‡ Anthems are frequently discontinued, even in places where they sing; except when there is a Communion the offertory and prayer for the Church Militant are generally omitted, and several portions of the clerical habiliments§ have fallen into disuse.

There are more serious omissions to which I will not now refer; such as the omission of the daily prayers, though every clergyman is directed to have them solemnized in his Church; such as the neglect of weekly Communions; such as the omission, when the Eucharist itself is administered, on the part of some of the clergy, to place the bread and wine, with their own hands, as an

* Note P. † Note Q. ‡ Note R. § Note S.

oblation on the altar, although at the last review of the Liturgy, a rubric was expressly and deliberately introduced to compel this observance; such as the neglect, on the part of others, to give that Sacrament with the words addressed to each individual communicant; for these are omissions of too serious a nature to come under the head of mere ceremonies. With respect to the other matters to which I have referred, I am perfectly ready to admit that many of them are, in themselves, of very little moment; but when we are solemnly pledged to conform to the ceremonies of the Church of England, the tender conscience will be apt to inquire what those ceremonies are to the observance of which we are thus bound. Now some are of opinion that they act sufficiently up to their vow, when they observe such ceremonies as they find handed down to them in the congregation over which they are appointed to preside. Others may be of opinion that the ceremonies ought to be observed precisely as they were originally appointed. A third party are of opinion, to which I myself incline, that they act in perfect consistency with their pledges if they take things as they find them, merely guarding against further innovations; and if, as occasion offers, they return more nearly to the practice of the reformers, which they rejoice to think is the practice also of the primitive Church. But here again the Protestant Dissenters are prepared to upbraid us. Our ceremonies and our ecclesiastical habits, and in great part our services themselves, are the same as

those which are used by the Church of Rome, and therefore they accuse us of being papistical for retaining them. Here, then, we are again placed on the defensive, and how are we to defend ourselves? Some persons regret that so many of the old ceremonies were retained by our reformers, but defend them on the ground that they are not actually sinful, that in practice they have been much simplified, and they very properly conclude that it is better to observe them, since they are enjoined, than to commit schism. Others, on the contrary, defend us by acting again on the offensive: they accuse the sectarians in general of a want of due reverence for things sacred, a forgetfulness of the majesty of the Deity, who is approached too often in terms of ecstatic familiarity, amounting almost to profaneness; they appeal to the Scriptures which, while revealing to us the loving-kindness of our God, would at the same time impress our minds with a mysterious awe of Jehovah; and instead, therefore, of apologizing for our observances, they express their satisfaction that, by the solemnity of our services and the decorum of our ceremonies, the devotions of the Church are discriminated from the ranting and raptures of most modern sects. They may at the same time reverence our particular ceremonies as the relics of primitive devotion, and regard, with a sentiment a-kin to piety, what acts as one of the connecting links between us and our forefathers.*

* Thus our great reformer, Archbishop Parker, in his speech to the Convocation, speaks of our ceremonies:—"He had for exerting himself not only the precedent of the late martyrs of the Reformation,

At the same time they carry out the principle of the English reformers, and perceive how the retention of the ancient ceremonies disarms the Romanist of one of his arguments. We tell the Romanist that our's is the old Catholic Church of England—his, a new sect. And when he points to his ceremonies, as a badge of his antiquity, we can defy him to the proof, for, (more especially if our rubrics be duly observed), we have in common with him the ancient ceremonies of the primitive Church, and where he differs from us, he almost always differs on matters subsequently introduced.

Now here is certainly room for some diversity of opinion, but surely, my brethren, there can be *no* room for that fierceness of controversy with which this subject is sometimes approached. For whether we estimate the value of our ceremonies too highly or too meanly, in principle we are all united:—the ceremonies of the Church of England must be observed because we are pledged to observe them, and the ceremonies of the Church of England *only*.

I am far from intending to say that in these differences of opinion there is nothing of importance. If we were assembled in Convocation, empowered to make further reforms in our Church, or to discuss the need of them, our

but of saints of the earliest antiquity; that some of these in the first centuries arrived in this island, and have left us noble remains of their piety and success; and notwithstanding the instructions they left, and the usages they settled, are partly worn out by time and superstition, yet many of them have had a more happy conveyance, and reached down to the present age: and that it appears our constitutions and ceremonies are little different from what was then established."—*Collier*, ii. 537.

opinions with respect to the value of tradition would be important in the extreme; so would be our opinions concerning the efficacy of the Sacraments, and the relative value of primitive Ceremonies, if we were re-constructing our Baptismal and Liturgical offices; nor of less importance would be our opinions on the Apostolical Succession, if the decision were to rest with us whether the Church should recognize the ministerial functions of men not episcopally ordained. But happily for us these questions have been decided for us by the Church, and to the decision of the Church, by the very fact of our being Churchmen, we unanimously bow;—we receive her decisions as our common principle. The principles of the Church, as we have seen, form an insurmountable barrier between us and the Dissenter, both Romish and Protestant, and render union with either of those parties impossible. But to us Churchmen, surely our common principles,—if we be not carnal men cherishing in our hearts bitter envying and strife—must be a common bond of union. But how can this union be preserved, unless, like the Church itself, while we are firm to our principles, we are tolerant towards the opinions of our brethren? The rule of the Church is indeed admirable. If any clergyman, either by his teaching or by his conduct, violate any principle of the Church, he ought to be accused to the Bishop,—to receive such accusations is indeed one of the purposes for which our Diocesan holds his court among us on such

occasions as the present—and if, after trial, the accused be found guilty, he may be excommunicated and deposed. But the Church does not permit one preacher to pronounce a judgment, as it were *ex cathedrâ*, on another, to anathematize his opinions when he cannot canonically prove him to be guilty of heresy, or even *officially* to attempt the refutation of them; for our 53rd Canon enacts, "If any preacher shall, in the pulpit, particularly or namely, of purpose, impugn or confute any doctrine delivered by any other preacher in the same Church, or in any Church near adjoining, before he hath acquainted the bishop of the diocese therewith, and received order from him what to do in that behalf,"—he shall be liable to suspension;* a regulation this, obviously just and wise. We may descend from our official situation, and appear in the arena on equal terms as controversialists, if in opinion we unfortunately differ; but in this case, the one controversialist is not more infallible than the other, and if, *pendente lite*, one party takes upon him officially to give sentence on the other, what is this but a *petitio principii* as absurd as it is intolerant? In very truth, if each individual preacher were permitted thus to erect himself into an infallible Pope, fulminating his anathemas to the right hand and to the left, we should live for a time in a state of Ishmaelitish discord, when our hand would be against every man, and every man's hand against us, and at last

* Note T.

we should subside into a despotism and tyranny worse than Rome ever invented, or Geneva contemplated.

Needful it is to make these observations, since, as I have hinted before, the worst part of the periodical and (so called) religious press, are by their misrepresentations inflaming the passions of weaker brethren in the ministry, and are calling upon them, under the pretence of speaking out for the truth, to violate the laws of the Church, and by turning it into the platform of angry contention thus to desecrate the pulpit. Remember, brethren, that if the propagation of evangelic truth be one portion of our duty, it is no less our duty, by the sacrifice of all personal considerations, by the humiliation of our proud, the restraint of our angry, the denial of our selfish passions—by the due control even of our better emotions—to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Remember, brethren, that our enemies are many and mighty: the two extremes of Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism are banded, together with Infidelity, against us, and if, like Sampson's foxes, they are pulling different ways, the brands which are attached to them have one and the self-same object—our destruction. And is this a time to divide our house, and to form parties and factions? Is this the season for discord? Remember, brethren, the ties, the sacred ties, which bind us to one another: as men, we are all under the same condemnation, we are all heirs of the same corrupted nature, equally one

and all children of wrath: as Christians, we seek for reconciliation with an offended Maker, through the atoning merits and the all-prevailing intercession of the same crucified, the same glorified Saviour, through the sanctification of the same Blessed Spirit: we worship the same God, the Trinity in Unity. We are brethren of the same household, with one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all; ministers of Christ acting under the same apostolical commission, pledged all to walk by the same rule, and to speak the same thing; bound all by the same vows, with interests, and pursuits, and duties, and privileges identical; where, I ask again, can Christian unanimity and harmony be found if we find it not here? "*Sirs, ye are Brethren,*" Oh wrong not one another. *Sirs, ye are Brethren,* and your Master is praying in heaven that ye may be one even as he is one with the Father; Oh seek not by your passions to frustrate his work! *Sirs, ye are Brethren,*—as brethren let us act cordially together, and gradually our differences will lessen, our agreements will extend. Then shall we stand, a holy army, closely embodied together, prepared with redoubled vigor to prosecute our warfare against the powers of darkness,—and then we shall find how sweeter than the ointment with which Aaron was anointed, how refreshing, as the dews of Hermon, it is for brethren to dwell together in unity—then the peace of God will rest upon us; that peace which the world can neither give nor take away.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A, page 8.

"Although the word Καθολικὸς properly signifies universal, yet they [the ancient fathers] commonly used it in the same sense as we do the word orthodox, as opposed to an heretic, calling an orthodox man a Catholic, that is a son of the Catholic Church; as taking it for granted, that they, and they only, which constantly adhere to the doctrine of the Catholic or Universal Church, are truly orthodox; which they could not do, unless they had believed the Catholic Church to be so. And besides that, it is part of our very creed, that the Catholic Church is holy, which she could not be, except free from heresy, as directly opposite to true holiness."

Bp. Beveridge. Works ii. 197.

NOTE B, p. 14.

ON DEFERENCE TO TRADITION AND RESPECT FOR THE FATHERS.

Since a charge the most preposterous, of deviating from the principles of the Reformation is brought against those of our divines who defer

to tradition, and, in interpreting Scripture, have more respect for the consent of the fathers who lived in and near to the apostolic age, than for such commentators as Henry, Scott, &c. when opposed to the ancient interpretation, it may be well to refer to some other documents in addition to those alluded to in the body of this discourse. Reference is there made to the act of parliament which our reformers* obtained to enable them, with the civil sanction, to condemn, as heretics, those who propounded doctrines contrary to the canonical Scriptures, and to the decisions of the first four general councils. And we find that, on the authority here given, and with express reference to the first four general councils, our Church anathematized Socinianism in the year 1640:—

"Whereas, much mischief is already done in the Church of God, by the spreading of the damnable and cursed heresy of Socinianism, as being a complication of many ancient heresies, *condemned by the four first general councils*, and contrariant to the articles of religion now established in the Church of England——it is therefore decreed," &c.—*Can.* iv.

Sparrow's Collection.

How wisely our reformers made use of tradition and the fathers may be seen also by a

* When I speak of the English reformers, I mean those great men who were publicly, and by authority, concerned in the Reformation of the Church of England, and *not* every private Englishman who happened to write against popery in the 16th century.

reference to the rules laid down for the conference with the Romish priests and jesuits, among which we find the following:

"If they should shew any ground of Scripture, and wrest it to their sense, let it be shewed by the interpretation of the old doctors, such as were before Gregory I. For that in his time began the first claim of the supremacy by the Patriarch of Constantinople, and shortly after was usurped by the Bishop of Rome, the first founder of the Papacy and supremacy of that see, by the authority of Phocas, the traitor and murderer of his Lord.

"And as for the testimony of the latter Doctors, if they bring any, let them refuse them; for that the most part of the writers of that time, and after, yielded to the authority of the Emperor and the Bishop of Rome.

"If they can shew no Doctor that agreed with them in their said opinion before that time, then to conclude that they have no succession in that doctrine from the time of the Apostles, and above four hundred years after, (when doctrine and religion were most pure.) For that they can shew no predecessor whom they might succeed in the same. *Quod primum verum. Tertull.*

"If they allege any Doctor of that antiquity, then to view the place; and to seek the true meaning *ex præcedentibus et consequentibus;* or of other places out of the same Doctor. And to oppose other Doctors likewise writing of the same matter, in case the sentence of the said old Doctor shall seem to make against us."

Strype's Whitgift, vol. i. p. 197.

Well, indeed, would it be for the cause of truth, if the self-appointed disputants in favour of the Reformation, in their challenges to the Papists, would be guided by these rules. The, so called, "Reformation Society" would then be less injurious to the cause of the Reformation than it now is, and the Papists, with the worst cause, would less frequently come off triumphant.

We may now proceed to shew how, in regulating her practice and defending her conduct, the Church of England, whenever she has spoken authoritatively, has followed the example of her illustrious reformers, and shewn her deference to antiquity. It is well known that there were persons who were weak and foolish enough to scruple at our use of the sign of the cross. It is thus that in the 30th Canon the Church of England vindicates her retention of that ceremony:—

"Following the steps of our most worthy King, because he therein followeth the rules of the Scriptures, *and the practice of the primitive Church,* we do commend to all true members of the Church of England these our directions and observations ensuing: The honour and dignity of the name of the cross begat a reverend estimation even in the apostles' time (for aught that is known to the contrary), of the sign of the cross, which the Christians shortly after used in all their actions. The use of this sign in Baptism *was held by the primitive Church,* as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause. This continual and general use of the sign of the cross is evident *by the testimonies of the ancient fathers.*

"It must be confessed that, in process of time, the sign of the cross was greatly abused in the Church of Rome. But the abuse of a thing does not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, *in all things which they held and practised,* that, *as the Apology of the Church of England* confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men: and *only departeth from them in those particular points,* wherein they were fallen *both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders.*

"The sign of the cross in Baptism being thus purged from all Popish superstition and error, and reduced in the Church of England to the primary institution of it, upon those rules of doctrine concerning things indifferent, which are consonant to the Word of God, *and the judgments of all the ancient fathers*, we hold it the part of every private man, both minister and other, reverently to retain the true use of it prescribed by public authority."

Canon xxx.

The Apology of the Church of England, referred to in this canon, is the celebrated work of Bishop Jewell, than which no book, excepting the Common Prayer and the Books of Homilies, has received a greater share of public sanction and authority in the English Church. The whole plan of this work is an appeal to Catholic tradition and primitive consent against the innovations of the Church of Rome, and any selection of passages rather diminishes the force of his whole train of reasoning. This is plainly seen from the outset of his work, where he states the kind of charges brought against the reformers by the Romanists: "that we have made a tumultuous defection from the Catholic Church; that we despise the *authority of the primitive fathers and ancient councils;* that we have imprudently and insolently abrogated the ancient ceremonies.....*and by our own private authority, without the consent of a holy and general council, we have introduced new rites into the Church,*.....but that they have retained all things as they were delivered to them by the apostles, *approved by the ancient fathers,* and have been kept ever since, through all the intermediate ages

to this day."—*Chap.* i. *sect.* v. *Translation by a Person of Quality. A. D.* 1685. In answer to which he undertakes to prove "that not obscurely and craftily, but *bonâ fide*, before God, truly, ingeniously, clearly, and perspicuously, we teach the most holy gospel of God, and that the ancient fathers and the whole primitive Church are on our side, and that we have not without just cause left them, the Romish divines, and returned to the apostles, *and the ancient Catholic fathers.*"—*Sect.* 12. Accordingly every point of the Apology is illustrated by quotations of the words, and proofs of the practice, of the fathers. In a latter part of his work, not far from the middle, he returns to this point more specifically: "Though they, the Papists, have not the Scriptures on their side, perhaps they will pretend they have *the ancient doctors and holy fathers*, for that they have ever boasted that all antiquity and the perpetual consent of all times is for them, and that all our pretences are novel, and were never heard of till within the course of a very few years last past."—*Chap.* v. *sect.* i. The way in which he enters upon his answer to this, is very remarkable, as shewing the depth of principle which he perceived to be involved in this adherence to antiquity: "Now certainly there can nothing of more weight be said against religion than that it is new."—*Ibid.* In what follows there are several challenges to the Romanists on this very ground, proving, as the very learned writer of "*Letters from a Reformed*

Catholic"* says, how "the modern Protestant and Romanist have shifted positions." "Our doctrine, which we may much better call the *Catholic doctrine of Christ*,† is not so new but that it is commended to us by the Ancient of Days, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in most ancient monuments, the prophets, and gospels, and writings of the apostles.....But, then, as to their religion, if it be so ancient as they pretend, *why do they not prove it so from the examples of the primitive Church, from the old fathers, and the ancient councils?* Why doth so ancient a cause lie desolate and without a patron for so long a time? Indeed, they—the Romanists,—never want fire and swords; but, then, *as to the ancient fathers and councils, there is with them a deep silence.*"—*Ibid, sect.* 3. Again: "Why, then, should we trust them in relation to what they pretend concerning the fathers, the ancient councils and the Scriptures? They have not, O good God! they have not, on their side, what they pretend to have; they have neither antiquity, nor universality, nor the consent of either all times or all nations:‡ and

*These plain and powerful Letters are published by Messrs. Rivington, price 3d. They are generally attributed to the Rev. Edward Churton, M. A. Rector of Crayke, and they are worthy of his high reputation.

† It was not because their doctrine was *protestant*, but because it was *catholic*, that our Reformers and such Divines as Jewell, Nowell, Hooker, and Andrews defended the doctrines of the English Reformation. And in the declaration of faith which our Reformers directed to be made by ministers, they were required to say of the Book of Common Prayer, "that it is *catholic*, apostolic, and most for the edifying of God's people."—*Strype's Annals, vol.* 1, *pt.* i. *p.* 327.

‡ He evidently alludes here to the Rule of Vincentius.

to this day."—*Chap.* i. *sect.* v. *Translation by a Person of Quality. A. D.* 1685. In answer to which he undertakes to prove "that not obscurely and craftily, but *bonâ fide*, before God, truly, ingeniously, clearly, and perspicuously, we teach the most holy gospel of God, and that the ancient fathers and the whole primitive Church are on our side, and that we have not without just cause left them, the Romish divines, and returned to the apostles, *and the ancient Catholic fathers*."—*Sect.* 12. Accordingly every point of the Apology is illustrated by quotations of the words, and proofs of the practice, of the fathers. In a latter part of his work, not far from the middle, he returns to this point more specifically: "Though they, the Papists, have not the Scriptures on their side, perhaps they will pretend they have *the ancient doctors and holy fathers*, for that they have ever boasted that all antiquity and the perpetual consent of all times is for them, and that all our pretences are novel, and were never heard of till within the course of a very few years last past."—*Chap.* v. *sect.* i. The way in which he enters upon his answer to this, is very remarkable, as shewing the depth of principle which he perceived to be involved in this adherence to antiquity: "Now certainly there can nothing of more weight be said against religion than that it is new."—*Ibid.* In what follows there are several challenges to the Romanists on this very ground, proving, as the very learned writer of "*Letters from a Reformed*

Catholic"* says, how "the modern Protestant and Romanist have shifted positions." "Our doctrine, which we may much better call the *Catholic doctrine of Christ*,† is not so new but that it is commended to us by the Ancient of Days, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in most ancient monuments, the prophets, and gospels, and writings of the apostles.....But, then, as to their religion, if it be so ancient as they pretend, *why do they not prove it so from the examples of the primitive Church, from the old fathers, and the ancient councils?* Why doth so ancient a cause lie desolate and without a patron for so long a time? Indeed, they—the Romanists,—never want fire and swords; but, then, *as to the ancient fathers and councils, there is with them a deep silence.*"—*Ibid, sect.* 3. Again: "Why, then, should we trust them in relation to what they pretend concerning the fathers, the ancient councils and the Scriptures? They have not, O good God! they have not, on their side, what they pretend to have; they have neither antiquity, nor universality, nor the consent of either all times or all nations:‡ and

* These plain and powerful Letters are published by Messrs. Rivington, price 3d. They are generally attributed to the Rev. Edward Churton, M. A. Rector of Crayke, and they are worthy of his high reputation.

† It was not because their doctrine was *protestant*, but because it was *catholic*, that our Reformers and such Divines as Jewell, Nowell, Hooker, and Andrews defended the doctrines of the English Reformation. And in the declaration of faith which our Reformers directed to be made by ministers, they were required to say of the Book of Common Prayer, "that it is *catholic*, apostolic, and most for the edifying of God's people."—*Strype's Annals, vol.* 1, *pt.* i. *p.* 327.

‡ He evidently alludes here to the Rule of Vincentius.

and of this they are not ignorant themselves, though they craftily dissemble their knowledge; yea, at times, they will not obscurely confess it; and, therefore, they—*the Romanists*,—sometimes will allege that the sanctions of the ancient councils and fathers are such as may lawfully be changed; *for different decrees*, they say, will best suit the different state of *the Church in different times*." What follows is most important in the present state of the Romish controversy:—"And so they hide themselves under the name of a Church, and by a wretched sham delude mankind."—*Ibid.*

"Thus," says Bishop Jewell, when defending the English reformers, "have we been taught by Christ, the apostles, and BY THE HOLY FATHERS, and we do faithfully teach the children of God the same things, and for so doing are we to be called heretics by their great high priest?* Oh! immortal God! Have Christ and his apostles, and *so many fathers*, all erred? What, are Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gelasius, and Theodoret, apostates from the Catholic faith? Was the consent of so many bishops and learned men nothing but a conspiracy of heretics? Or that which was commendable in them, is it now blameable in us? Or that which was once true, is it

* Ultra-Protestants in these days, humbly imitating the high priest of Rome, the Pope, have gone so far as to call those who do, as Jewell tells us the English Reformers did, who teach the doctrine of Christ, of the apostles, *and* of the holy fathers, heretics. It may be well for them to see in whose steps they are treading, while an interesting work might be published on the Popery of Ultra-Protestantism.

now, because it displeaseth them, become false?" *Chap.* iii. *sect,* 2. He elsewhere affirms:—"When they, the Papists, have thus left nothing unsaid which can possibly be, though never so falsely and slanderously, objected against us, yet at least they cannot pretend that we have forsaken the Word of God, or the apostles of Christ, or the primitive Church."—*Chap.* iv. *sect.* 18. Again:—"We, the English reformers, have approached, as nearly as possibly we could do, the Church of the apostles, and *the ancient Catholic bishops and fathers*, which we know was yet a perfect, and, as Tertullian* saith, an unspotted virgin, and not contaminated with any idolatry, or any great or public error. Neither have we only reformed our doctrine, and *made it like theirs*, but we have also brought the celebration of the Sacraments, and the forms of our public rites and prayers to an exact resemblance with their institutions or customs."—*Chap.* vi. 15.

Nothing can be more clear than this statement of the intention of our Reformers, and of their principles of Reformation.

I need hardly remind the learned reader that all this is perfectly in accordance with the memorable challenge of Bishop Jewell to the advocates of Romanism. After enumerating the chief points of difference between the friends of the Reformation and the advocates of the Romish corruptions, he boldly says, "If any man alive

* It is observable that what Bishop Jewell here quotes as a dictum of Tertullian is in fact from Hegesippus apud *Euseb. Hist.* iii. 32.

were able to prove any of these articles by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, *or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive Church,* I promised them that I would give over and subscribe unto him." And he repeats the challenge: "If any one of our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles by any sufficient authority of Scripture, *doctors,* or *councils,* as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield to him and subscribe."—*Sermon on* 1 *Cor. at Paul's Cross,* 1560.

We find a similar challenge made by Archbishop Cranmer, a very short time before his death:—"Wherefore by your own description and rule of a Catholic faith, your doctrine and teaching in these four articles cannot be good and Catholic, except you can find it in plain terms in the Scripture, and *old Catholic doctors, which when you do* I will hold up my hand at the bar, and say guilty. And if you cannot, then it is reason that you do the like, *per legem talionis.*"—*(Answer to Gardyner. Works,* iii. 42.*)*

I may observe, by the way, that the principle on which Cranmer acted was well understood by his contemporaries, as appears, for instance, by the following verses, by J. Parkhurst, prefixed to the edition of this work, published in 1580:

Accipe præclarum, lector studiose, libellum,
Quem tibi Cranmerus scripserat ante rogos.
Hic docta sanctam tractat ratione synaxin,
Insistens, patres quas docuere, viis.

We find our divines still influenced by the same principle in the reign of James I. when certain commissioners were appointed by the King to examine into the conduct of Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro. Among other things, in the course of debate, the Archbishop complained "that we had made a schism, and set up a new altar against an old altar. We answered," say the episcopal divines, in their account of what took place, "that our altar was an old altar, conformable to that of the primitive Church, and that all innovations were from them, (the Papists,) and that herein we were content to be judged concerning those offices which we execute at the altar *by the writings of the fathers, the first general councils and ancient liturgies*, unto which we did constantly adhere."—*M. Ant. de Dominis, Abp. of Spalatro, his shiftings in religion*, 1624.

But to return to the canons. The observance of the ember days is enjoined in the 31st canon, because of "the holy and religious example of the *ancient fathers of the Church.*" In the 32nd canon the office of deacon is regarded as "a step or degree in the ministry according *to the judgment of the ancient fathers and the practice of the primitive Church.*"

The Homilies so abound with references to the fathers that I shall only quote from them one passage:—"Before all things this we must be sure of, especially that this Supper be done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did and com-

manded to be done, as the holy apostles used it, and the *good fathers* of the primitive Church frequented it."—*Hom. concerning the Sacrament, part* iii.

We may observe, further, that on this same principle of deference to the fathers our present authorized translation of the Scripture was conducted: one of the rules laid down for the observance of the translators being:—"When any word has several significations, that which has been commonly used *by the most celebrated fathers* should be preferred."—*Collier, Eccles. Hist.* ii. *p.* 694.

Allusion is made in the preceding discourse to the Hampton Court and Savoy conferences. The reader has only to refer to the proceedings of the former conference in *Collier*, ii, 674. to see how the English bishops, true to the principles of the English Reformation, defended all our usages before King James on the authority of the fathers and primitive practice. And in the commission for the Savoy conference, in 1661, the commissioners are appointed "to advise upon and revise the said Book of Common Prayer; comparing the same *with the most ancient Liturgies* which have been used in the Church in the primitive and purest times."—*Collier*, ii. *p.* 877. At the conference itself, to that part of the proposal, that prayers may consist of nothing doubtful, or questioned by pious, learned, and *orthodox* persons, the episcopal divines reply, that "since it is not

defined and ascertained *who* those orthodox persons are, they must either take all those for orthodox persons who have the assurance to affirm themselves such, and if so, the demand is unreasonable. For some who deny the divinity of the Son of God will style themselves orthodox, and yet there is no reason we should part with an article of our creed for their satisfaction. Besides the proposal requires an impossibility. For there never was, nor ever will be, any prayers couched in such a manner as not to be questioned by some people who call themselves pious, learned, and orthodox. *But if by orthodox is meant only those who adhere to Scripture, and the Catholic consent of antiquity*, they are not of opinion that any part of the English Liturgy has been questioned by such."—*Collier*, ii. *p.* 880.

It was from this respect for tradition that by the Puritans the Church of England was called "THE CHURCH OF THE TRADITIONERS." Thus in the celebrated "Protestation of the Puritans," in 1573, the Puritan is made to protest:—"I have now joined myself to the Church of Christ"—meaning a sect of Puritans—"which if I should now again forsake and *join myself with their traditions*, I should forsake the union wherein I am knit to the body of Christ, and join myself to the discipline of Antichrist. For in *the Church of the Traditioners* (i. e. the Church of England) there is no other discipline than that which hath been maintained by the Antichristian Pope of

Rome; whereby the Church of God hath always been afflicted, and is until this day. For the which cause I refuse them."—*Strype's Life of Abp. Parker*, ii. *p.* 284.

I am well aware that some persons venture to assert that the Reformers had no such deference themselves for tradition, but only employed tradition as a useful kind of argument against the Romanists. Not to mention that this is a gratuitous assertion, borne out by no one single fact, and not to insist upon the proof already given that a deference to tradition and to the fathers has been always manifested in all our authorized documents and debates, I will now direct the attention of the reader to the private writings of our reformed divines. Those writings are, indeed, of no more *authority* than the writings of any other author not publicly recognized by the Church, but they are useful as serving to throw light on the sense in which our services were understood by them. Even Latimer and Hooper affirmed that "they never advanced any thing but what is agreeable to Holy Scripture *and the Catholic faith.*"—*Collier*, ii. 277. With respect to Archbishop Cranmer, the difficulty is to make a selection from his works, which abound with references to the fathers. In his celebrated answer to Smythe's preface, he thus announces his rule of faith: "As for me I ground my belief upon God's Word, wherein can be no error, *having also the consent of the primitive Church.*"—*Works, vol.* iii. p. 3.

These were among his last words:

"Touching my doctrine of the Sacrament, and other my doctrine, of what kind soever it be, I protest that it was never my mind to write, speak, or understand any thing contrary to the most holy Word of God, *or else against the holy Catholic Church of* Christ, but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only, which I had learned from the sacred Scriptures, *and of the holy Catholic Church of* Christ *from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the Church.*

"And if any thing hath peradventure chanced otherwise than I thought, I may err; but heretic I cannot be, forasmuch as *I am ready in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred Word of God, and of the holy Catholic Church*, desiring none other thing than meekly and gently to be taught, if anywhere (which God forbid) I have swerved from the truth.

"And I profess and openly confess, that in all my doctrine and preaching, both of the Sacrament, and of other my doctrine whatsoever it be, not only *I mean and judge those things, as the Catholic Church and the most holy fathers of old with one accord have meant and judged*, but also I would gladly use the same words that they used, and not use any other words, but to set my hand to all and singular their speeches, phrases, ways, and forms of speech, which they do use in the treatises upon the Sacrament, *and to keep still their interpretation.* But in this thing I only am accused for a heretic, because I allow not the doctrine lately brought in of the Sacrament, and because I consent not to words not accustomed in Scripture and unknown to the ancient fathers but newly invented, and brought in by men, and tending to the destruction of souls, and overthrow of the old and pure religion."

Appeal from the Pope to the next General Council.
Works, vol. iv. *pp.* 126, 127.

It may indeed be shrewdly suspected that had these words been uttered in these days, by any of those high churchmen who are the representatives of the English reformers, they would have caused the press to groan with various anathematizing

protests, and the platform to echo with eloquent declamations on the revival of Popery, deviation from the principles of the reformation, &c. &c. But let us turn from one of our martyr-reformers to another, to that unflinching high-churchman Bishop Ridley :—

"In that the Church of God is in doubt, I use herein the wise counsel of Vincentius Lirinensis, whom I am sure you will allow, who giving precepts how the Catholic Church may be in all schisms and heresies known, writeth in this manner: 'When,' saith he, 'one part is corrupted with heresies, then prefer the whole world before that one part; but if the greatest part be infected, then prefer antiquity.' In like sort now, when I perceive the greatest part of Christianity to be infected with the poison of the see of Rome, *I repair to the usage of the primitive Church.*"

Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 613, 614.

Again :—

"For we have, (high praise be given to God therefore,) most plainly, evidently and clearly on our side, all the prophets, all the apostles, and *undoubtedly all the ancient ecclesiastical writers which have written* until of late years past *(usque ad tempora neotericorum)*.

Translation of a Letter to his Brethren in Captivity.
Martyrs' Letters, p. 29, 30.

What indeed was it that recommended Ridley in the first instance to Cranmer? "His well known acquaintance with Scripture and the fathers."—*Soame's His. of Ref.* iii. 28. And "the result of this honourable perseverance in his studies was a gradual but firm conviction that Popery was the religion neither of Scripture *nor of ecclesiastical antiquity.*"—*Ib.* iii. 28.

Nay, why were our reformers burnt? Let Bradford give the answer: "To believe as the

Word of God teacheth, *the primitive church believed, and all the Catholic and good holy fathers taught for five hundred years at least after Christ,* will not serve, and therefore I am condemned and burned out of hand."—*Martyrs' Letters, p.* 270.

Mr. Churton, in his very learned and judicious Visitation Sermon, from which this quotation is taken, observes that "similar declarations are to be found in the Letters of the Martyrs, Laurence Saunders to Stephen Gardyner, p. 202-3, Robert Glover, a layman, p. 535, and Cariless, p. 614."—*Churton's Visitation Sermon, p.* 25.

To this I will add the following very useful remarks by Bishop Cheney; whose character was aspersed most fiercely by the Puritans, but is defended by Strype. (*Annals* i. i. 422.) Cheney was one of the six reformers who in the first convocation of Queen Mary's reign, being then Archdeacon of Hereford, "undertook boldly the cause of the gospel in a disputation against almost the whole synod." The following extracts are from a sermon delivered when he was Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, in Bristol Cathedral:

"These new writers in matters of controversy, as Mr. Calvin and others, agree not together, but are at dissention among themselves, and are together by the ears. Therefore take heed of them. Yet read them: for in opening the text, they do pass many of the old fathers. And they are excellently well learned in the tongues: but in matters now in controversy follow them not, but follow *the old fathers and doctors,* although Mr. Calvin denieth some of them." "Scriptures, Scriptures do you cry? Be not too hasty: for so the heretics always cried, and had the Scriptures. I would ask this question; I have to do with

an heretic; I bring Scripture against him; and he will confess it to be Scripture. But he will deny the sense that I bring it for. How now? How shall this be tried? *Marry, by consent of Fathers only, and not by others.*" "Good people, I must now depart shortly. Keep, therefore, this lesson with you. Believe not, neither follow this city nor yet 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; but follow you *the Catholic and universal consent.*"

Strype's Annals, i. *pt.* 2, p. 278-280.

For preaching thus, certain puritan Aldermen of the city of Bristol complained of their Bishop, but the fact that their complaint was disregarded only serves to shew that in preaching thus he only preached, when in prosperity, the doctrines of that Reformation, which, in adversity and at peril of his life, he had maintained with such boldness.

From this circumstance we may see that the high-church English reformers and their disciples did not in those days, any more than in these, escape the reproaches of Ultra-protestants, and what follows will shew that the tone and temper of Ultra-protestantism was not one whit more tolerant or Christian then than it is now.

"There came unto Bernard Gilpin" (a confessor though not a martyr of the Reformation) "a certaine Cambridge man, who seemed a very great scholler, and hee dealt earnestly with Mr. Gilpin touching the discipline and reformation of the Church."* Mr. Gilpin tould him that he could not allow that an human invention should take place in the Church instead of a divine institution. And how? Doe you thinke, saith the man, that this form of discipline" (that of the Ultra-protestants or Puritans) "is a human invention? 'I am,' saith Mr. Gilpin,

* This is an instance of what will be shewn in a future citation to have been the prevalent opinion of the Ultra-Protestants from the time when our Reformation was completed, that the Reformation had not gone far enough.

'altogether of that mind. And as many as shall have turned over the writings of *auncient fathers* will be of mine opinion. I suspect that form of discipline which appeareth not to have been received by any auncient Church." "'But yet,' saith the man, 'latter men do see many things which those auncient fathers saw not; and the present Church seemeth better provided of many ingenious and industrious men.' Mr. Gilpin seemed somewhat moved at that word, and replied: 'I for my part do not hould the virtues of the latter men worthy to be compared with the infirmities of the fathers.' The other man made answer that he supposed Mr. Gilpin to be in error in that point."

Life of Gilpin. Wordsworth. Biog. iv. *p.* 122.

Many men may at the present time be of "the other man's opinion," and dispise "the auncient fathers,"—of course, I mean, after deep study of them; but they ought not to accuse, as popish, and inimical to the principles of the *English* Reformation, those who tread in the steps of Gilpin, and Ridley, and Cranmer, and a host of others who might be named. On the passage above quoted, Dr. Wordsworth makes the following note, which, as elucidating our subject, I shall now transcribe:—

"The Puritans seem to have been very little scrupulous in exalting themselves and their partizans to the disparagement of former ages. 'I have heard it credibly reported, says Dr. Bancroft, that in a certain college at Cambridge, when it happeneth that in their disputations the authoritye either of St. Augustin, or of St. Ambrose, or of St. Jerome, or of any other of the ancient fathers; nay, the whole consent of them all altogether is alleged; it is rejected with very great disdaine; as what tell you me of St. Augustine, or St. Ambrose, or of the rest? I regard them not a rush. Were they not men? Whereas at other time when it happeneth that a man of another humour doth aunswere, if it fall out that he beinge pressed with the authority either of Calvin or Beza shall chance to deny it; you shall see some begin to smile in commiseration of such the poor man's simplicity; some

grow to be angry in regard of such presumption; and some will depart away, accounting such a fellow not worthy the hearing.' *Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline, p.* 64, compare p. 329. And Sir Francis Bacon, speaking of the same *mal-content* party tells us, that they no more scrupled to set themselves *above the first reformers and martyrs*, than they did over *the ancient fathers*, "as in affection they challenge the virtues of zeal and the rest; so in knowledge they attribute unto themselves light and perfection. *They say the Church of England in King Edward's time, and in the beginning of her Majesty's reign, was but in the cradle:* and the bishops of those times did somewhat grope for daybreak; but that maturity and fulness of light proceedeth from themselves."

Of Ch. Controversies. Works ii. p. 384. *Edit.* 1753.

Such and so multiplied being the testimonies to the principle on which our Reformation was conducted, and so easily accessible to the student, as contained in the public documents of the Church, and the most popular records and memorials of the time, it does appear somewhat astonishing that there should be found professed members of the Church of England who think that they can consistently declaim against the use of tradition, decry the appeal to antiquity, and depreciate the Fathers; nay more, that they should go the length of denouncing those who defer to the rule of primitive doctrine and primitive practice, as persons who have departed from the principles of the English Reformation. The want of information betrayed by these accusers, discreditable as it is, is still more offensive when it is found, as too frequently is the case, accompanied with a want of candour and a tone of insult towards those

whom they cannot or will not understand.* Such controversialists are best characterised in the following extract from Mr. Palmer's Treatise on the Church. Strong as it is, it is not too strong a protest against the practices of which I complain; and its statements of the true position of the English Church are otherwise clear and important.

"The various methods which these men employ in endeavouring to prevent any appeal to the tradition of the Church, may be classed under the following heads:

"1. Systematic misrepresentation.

"We do not appeal in proof of Christian doctrine, to the ancient Christian writers as in any way *infallible*. Our sentiments on this head are well known: they have been repeatedly explained. We hold that the doctrine of any father, however great and learned he may have been, *e. g.* that of Augustine, Athanasius, Ambrose, or Basil, is to be *rejected* in any point where it contradicts Scripture. We consider all these writers as uninspired men, and therefore liable to mistakes and errors like other theologians.† Therefore it involves a studied misrepresentation of our

* An instance of this may be given in a work just advertised under the title of "Revelation not Tradition." This title is evidently assumed to imply that the advocates of the English Reformation elevate tradition above the Bible, or that they place tradition on an equality with it—thereby insinuating a gross and uncharitable falsehood.

† This shews the useless trouble that some persons take, in these times, who think that they can set aside the principle of deference to antiquity if, by chance, they can detect any absurdity in the writings of any of the fathers. The depth of scriptural learning and scriptural piety to be found in the pages of the primitive fathers and martyrs of the Christian Church will always excite the admiration, as it did that of the English reformers, of all who consult their writings without prejudice. Their excellence is, if possible, still more strongly attested by the fact, that when they were assailed in the seventeenth century, by some Protestants of real learning but perverted judgment, no charge of any importance could be substantiated against them, and the attempt to set aside their usefulness in deciding controversy was so triumphantly refuted, that it has never been revived by any name respectable for learning or talent. *The appeal to their writings can never, in fact, be dispensed with, unless it can be shewn, not only that they abound in*

meaning and principle, when we are met by assertions or proofs that particular fathers have taught errors in faith or morality; that they were credulous; that their writings are in some points obscure; that their criticisms or interpretations of Scripture are sometimes mistaken; that they invented scholastic doctrines, and were tinged with false philosophy; that the later fathers were better theologians than the earlier; that there are fathers against fathers, and councils against councils, on some points. This is all calculated merely to excite prejudice against an appeal to the doctrine of the Church, by misrepresenting our design and principle in making it. Our answer to all these arguments is, that we do not appeal to the fathers as inspired and authoritative writers, but as competent witnesses of the faith held by Christians in their days. If they are not to be trusted in this, they are not to be trusted in their testimony to the facts of Christianity, and the external evidence of revelation is subverted.

"2. Pretended respect for religion.

"Under this head may be classed that mode of argument which rejects any appeal to the doctrine of the Christian Church, under pretence that the word of God alone ought to be the rule of our faith in opposition to all the doctrines of man; that the Scripture constitutes a perfect rule of faith, needing nothing else; that it must necessarily be plain in all essential points, and that it is its own interpreter. The *end* of all this pretended reverence for Scripture is, to obtain an unlimited liberty of interpreting it according to our own reason and judgment, even in opposition to the belief of all Christians from the beginning. But in asserting this liberty to all men, it follows inevitably that no particular interpretation of Scripture is necessary to salvation; that Scripture has no divine meaning; that it is *not a revelation.* In short,

erroneous private interpretations, but that they are incompetent moral evidence to a question of fact, and cannot be considered as exhibiting to us the faith and practice of the Church in their time. Such books as have lately appeared in depreciation of the Fathers, written by the mere zanies of literature, who, case-hardened in self-conceit, are ignorant of the languages in which the Fathers wrote, and utterly unacquainted with ecclesiastical history, are, indeed, fit only to be regarded as *jest-books* in the learned world; but the spirit of slavish mockery which they breathe, still finds acceptance, as every thing else does, which flatters the pride of reason and favours the indolence of man.

tradition is thrown aside, under pretence of veneration for the Scripture, in order that men may be enabled to distort, or misinterpret, and to destroy that very Scripture.

"The same may be observed of that pretended zeal for the defence of the reformation, which infidels, unitarians, and other enemies of the doctrine and discipline of the Church allege as a plea for rejecting all appeal to the doctrines of the universal Church. "The doctrines of the *reformation*," they say, "cannot be defended if this appeal is allowed: *popery* must triumph." Excellent men! They will maintain the reformation at all hazards: all evidence shall be pronounced worthless if it be opposed to the interests of that sacred cause. But what is the end sought by all this pretended devotion? It is, that every man may be permitted, without any check, to interpret Scripture in such a manner as to *subvert* all the doctrines of the reformation, whether positive or negative, to prove the reformation itself needless, erroneous, bigoted, equally absurd as the system to which it was opposed, and more inconsistent. I charge these men with the grossest hypocrisy. Never was there a more daring attempt to palm an imposture on the credulous and unthinking, than this effort of deists and heretics to set aside tradition under pretence of zeal for the Reformation. They are the opponents of the Reformation. They are the representatives of those whom the Reformation condemned. They reject its doctrines, they charge it with ignorance, bigotry, intolerance, errors as gross as those of Popery. They have separated from its reformed institutions, as *anti-christian*, and only exist by a perpetual attack upon them. The Reformation has no connexion with these men; its defence belongs exclusively to those who maintain its doctrines, and adhere to its institutions; and they alone are proper judges of the mode of argument suited to its interests.

"3. Statements directly untrue.

"Under this head may be included the palmary argument employed by all sects against any appeal to the tradition of the Church universal, namely, that it was the principle of the Reformation to reject any such appeal; and its principle was, 'the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants.' Nothing can be more untrue than this assertion: the Reformation as a whole

acknowledged and appealed to the authority of Catholic tradition, though it denied the infallibility of particular fathers and councils. With equal veracity it is asserted that the Church of England rejects tradition by her sixth article of religion, when it is manifest that her object is simply to maintain the necessity of scriptural proof for articles of faith; while our canons, our ritual, and the whole body of our theologians, have so notoriously upheld the authority of tradition, that it is a subject of unmeasured complaint on the part of those who disbelieve the doctrines of the church.

"The nature of these various arguments testifies sufficiently that the doctrine of the universal Church is opposed to those who employ them. It could be nothing but a feeling of despair on this point, which could have induced men to resort to perpetual misrepresentation, to false pretences, and to untruths. The employment of these weapons by all sects, in order to prevent any appeal to universal tradition, proves two points. First, as the sole fundamental principle on which they all agree is, the rejection of an appeal to the doctrines of the Church as a check on the interpretation of Scripture, and the assertion of an unlimited right of private interpretation; this principle is the source of all their divisions and contradictions, and therefore must be radically false. Secondly, the doctrine of the universal Church from the beginning must condemn that of all modern sects, in every point in which they differ from our Catholic and Apostolic Churches; and therefore on every such point they are in error, and misinterpret Scripture, and the Church is in the right."

Palmer. Treatise on the Church, ii. 55.

To this I cannot refrain from appending the following spirited remarks from another celebrated modern author, the Rev. George Stanley Faber, whose learned work "On Election" ought to be in the hands of every one who wishes to distinguish Scriptural truth from both Calvinistic and Arminian error.

"The principle, for which I contend, is so thoroughly rational and so perfectly intelligible, that, to every honestly

investigating mind, it cannot fail most amply to approve itself. Yet a member of the Anglican Church may be additionally satisfied, when he learns that the principle before us is the very principle adopted by that truly apostolic community.

"Renouncing the self-sufficient licentiousness of that miscalled and misapprehended right of private judgment, which dogmatically pronounces upon the *meaning* of Scripture from a mere insulated *inspection* of Scripture, and which rapidly decides that such *must* be the sense of Scripture, because an individual *thinks* that such *is* the sense of Scripture: renouncing this self-sufficient and strangely unsatisfactory licentiousness, the Church of England, with her usual sober and modest judiciousness, has always professed to build her code of doctrine, *authoritatively*, indeed, upon SCRIPTURE ALONE, but *hermeneutically* upon SCRIPTURE AS UNDERSTOOD AND EXPLAINED BY PRIMITIVE ANTIQUITY.

"Herein she has judged well and wisely.

"SCRIPTURE and ANTIQUITY are the two pillars upon which all rationally-established faith must ultimately repose.

"If we reject SCRIPTURE, we reject the very basis of theological belief. If we reject ANTIQUITY, we reject all historical evidence of soundness of interpretation.

"When in our inquiries after revealed truth, the two are combined, we attain to MORAL CERTAINTY: and, in matters which by their very nature admit not of mathematical proof, *moral certainty* is the highest point to which we can possibly attain."

Faber on Election, pp. 11, 13.

Again he says in another place:

"Among unread or half-read persons of our present somewhat confident age, it is a not uncommon saying: That THEY *disregard the early Fathers;* and that THEY *will abide by nothing save the decision of Scripture alone.*

"If by *a disregard of the early Fathers* they mean that they allow them not individually that personal authority in exposition which the Romanists claim for them, they certainly will not have *me*, at least, for an opponent: And, accordingly, I have shewn that, in the interpretation of the Scripture terms

Election and *Predestination*, I regard the insulated individual authority of Augustine, just as little as I regard the insulated individual authority of Calvin.

"But, if, by *a disregard of the early Fathers*, they mean that they regard them not as evidence to the FACT of *what* doctrines were or were not received by the Primitive Church, and from her were or were not delivered to posterity; they might just as rationally talk of the surpassing wisdom of extinguishing the light of history by way of more effectually improving and increasing our knowledge of past events; for, in truth, under the aspect in which they are specially important to *us*, the early Fathers are neither more nor less than so many historical witnesses.

"Again: if, by *An abiding solely by the decision of Scripture*, they mean that, as a binding or authoritative rule of faith, they will receive nothing save what is contained in Scripture; no person, I suppose, who rejects that idle supplemental tradition which the Council of Trent invites us to receive with the *same* confidence as Holy Scripture itself, will think of differing from them: for the Bible, and the Bible alone, is doubtless the rule of faith with all Protestants.

"But, if, by *An abiding solely by the decision of Scripture*, they mean that, utterly disregarding the recorded doctrinal system of that primitive Church which conversed with and was taught by the apostles, they will abide by nothing save their own crude and arbitrary private expositions of Scripture; we certainly may well admire their intrepidity, whatever we may think of their modesty: for, in truth, by such a plan, while they call upon us to despise the sentiments of Christian antiquity so far as we can learn them upon distinct historical testimony, they expect us to receive, without hesitation, and as undoubted verities, *their own* mere modern upstart speculations upon the sense of God's holy word; that is to say, the evidence of the early Fathers and the hermeneutic decisions of the primitive Church we may laudably and profitably contemn, but *themselves* we must receive (for they themselves are content to receive themselves) as well nigh certain and infallible expositors of Scripture."

Faber on the Primitive Doctrine of Election, p. 184.

NOTE C. p. 16.

LUTHERANS.

On this subject see *Palmer's Treatise on the Church of Christ, P.* i. *ch.* xii. *sec.* 2. Having produced a variety of proof to shew the principle on which the early Lutherans acted, he says, "All these things prove that the Lutherans did not voluntarily separate from the Church; and that, at all events, for a *long time*, they desired to be re-united to its full communion." No small number of Protestants, in succeeding ages, considered them as having gone to very unjustifiable lengths, and made much too large concessions for the sake of peace; but the truth is, they were deeply and duly impressed with the evils of separation, and its contradiction to the divine will; and felt that no obstacles, except those which arose from certain, clear, and irrefragable necessity, ought to prevent union.

"It is clear that the Lutherans did not wish to separate from the Church, and that they were ready to make concessions to regain its communion. It would be, also, a great mistake to suppose that Luther, or his party, *designed* to effect a reformation of the Church:* they were driven entirely by the force of circumstances to adopt the course they did. It was not premeditated nor desired by them. They would have widely altered the Lutheran system, which was a merely temporary arrangement, if by so doing they could have recovered the communion of the Church. But the opposition of the Roman

* That is to say, they did not intend, as individuals, to reform the Church for which they could have no authority, but only to suggest to the consideration of the Church the reformation which was unquestionably required, and which was accordingly effected in our own country by the Church itself.

see thwarted these designs, the Council of Trent rendered them still more difficult; and, in time, the Lutherans forgot that their system was merely provisional, pretended to justify it as ordinary and sufficient, and lost their desire for accommodation with the Roman and German Churches."

Palmer, i. *pp.* 370, 371.

Note D. p. 17.

THE PURITANS AND ULTRA-PROTESTANTS ATTACHED TO THE FOREIGN REFORMATION, AND DISCONTENTED WITH THE ENGLISH REFORMERS FOR NOT GOING FAR ENOUGH.

As it is natural to suppose there was a party in England who from the beginning wished to force the English Reformers to extreme measures, and in the Marian persecution,

"Some of these going to Geneva, and other places, which had embraced the model of Reformation settled by Calvin, they became fond of these foreign novelties, and some of them at Frankford, in the year 1554, began an alteration of the Liturgy, and did what they could to draw others to them; and to these men Knox, the great incendiary of Scotland, afterwards joyned himself; and not long after one Whitehead, a zealous Calvinist, but of a much better temper than Knox: not contented with this alteration, the fifteenth of November, 1554, they writ letters in open defiance of the English Liturgy to them of Zurick, who defended it in a letter of the 28th of the same month."

"Grindal and Chambers were sent from Strasburgh to Frankford to quiet these innovators, but to no purpose; so returning back again, the English, at Strasburgh, wrote to them the 13th of December, all which procured no other regard for them, but only to obtain Calvin's judgment of it, which being suitable to their own, as there was no wonder it should, things continued thus till the 13th of March following, when Dr. Richard Cox entered Frankford, drove Knox out, and re-settled the Liturgy there. Whereupon, in the end of August following,

Fox, with some few others, went to Basil; but the main body followed Knox and Goodman to Geneva, their mother city (as Dr. Heylyn styles it), where they made choice of Knox and Goodman for their constant preachers; under which ministry they rejected the whole frame and fabric of the Reformation made in England in King Edward's time, and conformed themselves wholly to the fashions of the Church of Geneva," &c.

Life of Jewell. Wordsworth's Biography, iv. 37.

In answer to an address from the English at Frankfort, Calvin wrote thus in condemnation of the English Reformers:

"I cannot always think it profitable to comply with the foolish waywardness of some few men," (i. e. the English Reformers) "who are resolved to remit nothing *of their ancient customs*. I cannot but observe many *tolerable fooleries* in the English Liturgy, *tolerabiles ineptias*, such as you have described it to me. By which two words, tolerable fooleries, I mean only this, that there is not such purity and perfection as was to be desired in it; which imperfections, notwithstanding, not being to be remedied at first, were to be borne with for a time, in regard that no manifest impiety was retained in them. It was therefore so far lawful to begin with such *beggarly rudiments* that the learned, grave, and godly ministers of Christ might be encouraged *for proceeding further* in setting out somewhat which might prove more pure and perfect. If true religion had flourished till this time in the Church of England, it had been necessary that many things in that book" (the Book of Common Prayer) "should have been omitted and others altered to the better." He afterwards expresses his dislike of those who by being attached to the Book of Common Prayer "*are so much delighted with the dregs of Popery.*"

The answer and judgment of that famous and excellent learned man Mr. John Calvin, the late pastor of Geneva, touching the Book of England, after he had perused the same faithfully translated into Latin by Mr. Whittingham.

See also Heylyn's History of the Presbyterians, pp. 15, 16.

"Some of the English exiles, who had been friendly entertained in Switzerland and Geneva, came home prepossessed in favour of the model of these Churches; and thus being disaffected to our Book of Common Prayer, they would have gladly set up *a foreign establishment.*"—*Collier. Eccles. Hist.* ii. 417. "Upon Queen Elizabeth's accession to the throne, the English exiles at Geneva seemed willing to make up the old difference with their brethren, and moved towards a reconciliation. But then their proposals are somewhat narrow and reflecting; they called the ceremonies trifles, *they proposed the best reformed Churches, that is, Calvin's Congregation,* for the measure of agreement."—*Collier*, ii. 412.

Hence arose the two parties alluded to in the sermon, whom we may designate Protestants and Ultra-protestants, meaning by Protestants those who were attached to the system of the *English*, and by the Ultra-protestants those who were attached to the system of the foreign or Swiss reformers, from whom may be said to be legitimately descended the whole body of Ultra-protestants, who reject all Church authority, and put forth, on every occasion, the maxim that "the Bible only forms the religion of Protestants;" whilst, in fact, they invariably adhere to the modern interpretation of some favourite commentator; such as Calvin or Beza, or, in later times, Scott or Henry; or (what is yet more convenient) to the exposition of Scripture by some popular

preacher of the day. The Puritans continued to be supported by foreign influence; for Beza proposed to Archbishop Grindal, "that the Church of England should unite with the reformed Churches of France, Geneva, and Switzerland in a common confession of faith. But the English hierarchy thought it more advisable to stand on their own bottom, than to incorporate their belief with *foreign* systems, and make themselves responsible for every thing defined by the reformed abroad.—*Collier*, ii. *p.* 512.

Beza mentions, in a letter to Bullinger, that the English Church was, according to his notions, in a lamentable condition; that, as he was informed from some of the brethren there, *Popery was never thrown out*, but rather transferred from his Holiness to her Majesty, he formerly hoped that the dispute had only been about caps and surplices, but now, to his great grief, he finds the controversy goes much further. "Afterwards he takes notice that Queen Elizabeth *had so strong an aversion to the Geneva Church*, that she received the present of his Annotations without the least sign of its being welcome."—*Collier*, ii. *p.* 503. Beza was perfectly correct in stating that the dispute was more than a mere dispute about caps and surplices: the dispute in reality involved a principle,—that principle being whether the Church of England should "conform to the government" of the ancient Church, or to that of the Genevan sect: that point once conceded, other alterations would follow as

a matter of course. Hence the zeal on the part of the puritans to urge, and the determination on the part of the English reformers to resist, alteration in the ecclesiastical habits and ceremonies. This was clearly perceived at the time. In 1562 the question relating to the rites and ceremonies was debated in convocation. Among those who voted for the retention of the old Catholic rites still in use, Strype mentions the Dean of Westminster and the Chaplains of the Archbishop, (our great reformer, Archbishop Parker,) Peerson and Ithel, who were themselves afterwards Bishops. "These," he says "had a great deference for the reformation of religion, as it was settled under King Edward; and so were for a strict and unaltered observation of the Liturgy and orders of it as it then stood. But those who were for alterations, and stripping the English Church of her usages then retained and used, were such (as I find by their names subscribed) as had lately lived abroad in the reformed churches of Geneva, Switzerland, or Germany; and *so out of partiality to them, endeavoured to accommodate this Church of England to their model.* But the divines on the other side reckoned the wisdom, learning, and piety of Cranmer and Ridley, and the other reformers of this Church, to be equal, every way, with those of the foreign reformers."—*Strype's Annals, vol.* i. *pt.* i. *p.* 504.

"Soon after another sort, or rank of the same sort arose," *i. e.* the Puritans, "that were not

satisfied with the Reformation of this Church, but would have it *reformed again* by the Word of God, as they urged, disliking the discipline and government, and ceremonies thereof; *so far forth as it varied from the Churches*" (*i. e.* Protestant sects,) "*abroad*; and out of great admiration, chiefly of that of Geneva, *crying out to have our Church framed according to their model.*"—*Strype's Annals, vol.* i. *pt.* ii. *p.* 349.

"These men," says the Biographer of the Reformers in another place, alluding again to the Puritans, "were especially angry with the bishops and their order because they were the chief opposers of their *new discipline* and preservers of King Edward's Reformation, and therefore they did what they could to pull up this hierarchy by the roots, asserting it to be Anti-christian and utterly unlawful to be exercised in the Christian Church." *Strype's Parker*, ii. 285.

Hitherto I have adduced a few out of the many passages which might be quoted to shew the foreign origin and foreign partialities of the Ultra-protestants. I shall now proceed to shew, what has already been made partially apparent, that the complaint against the Church of England has been, from the beginning, that it did not go far enough,—that in other words, the English Reformers were distinguished from the foreign Reformers, by being High-Churchmen. Strype asserts that the Puritans refused to conform "unless there were a further reformation."—*Life*

of Grindal, p. 65.* And we find the work of our illustrious Reformers thus described by the historian of the Puritans: "The service performed in the Queen's Chapel, and in sundry cathedrals, was so *splendid and showy that foreigners could not distinguish it from the Roman,* except that it was performed in the English tongue. By this method most of the Popish laity were deceived into conformity, and came regularly to Church for nine or ten years, till the Pope, being out of all hopes of an accommodation, forbad them, by excommunicating the Queen, and laying the whole nation under an interdict."—*Neal's Hist. of the Puritans,* i. 156. This writer had discernment enough to see the object of the English reformers, though he had not the wisdom to approve it, when he remarked that, "*the English reformers wished to depart no further from the Church of Rome, than she from the primitive Church.*"—*Neal,* i. 56.

He was correct in this assertion for "sodeine chaunges," said our Martyr-Reformer, Bishop Ridley, "without substantial and necessary causes, and the heady setting forth of extremities I did never love."—*Martyrs' Letters, p.* 40, *ed.* 1564.

To the wisdom of the course adopted by the English Reformers ample testimony was borne by Monsieur Rognie, the French Ambassador, who declared, upon a view of our solemn service

* See also *Annals, vol.* ii. *pt.* 1, *p.* 274, where they are spoken of as "persons labouring for a still further Reformation."

and ceremonies, "if the reformed Churches in France had kept on the same advantage of order and decency, I am confident there would have been many thousand Protestants in that country more than there is."—*Collier*, ii. 677. But the *via media* of the English Reformers was the great cause of offence to the Genevan sect in England. For instance, in 1573 we find our great Reformer, Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, under whose primacy our present Ritual and Liturgy were arranged and the Thirty-nine Articles drawn up, writing, in conjunction with the Bishop of London, to some absent Bishop, to this effect: "Sal. in Christo. These times are troublesome. The Church is sore assaulted; *but not so much of open enemies, as of pretended favorers and false brethren, who under colour of reformation* seek the ruin and subversion both of learning and religion." *Strype's Parker*, ii. 280. "The refusers of the orders of the Church, who by this time were commonly called Puritans, were grown now into two factions. The one was of a more quiet and peaceable demeanour, who, indeed, would not use the habits or subscribe to the ceremonies enjoined; *as kneeling at the Sacrament, the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage,* but held the communion of the Church, and willingly and devoutly joined in the Common Prayers. But another sort there was who disliked the whole constitution of the Church lately reformed, charging upon it *many gross remainders of Popery*, and that it was still full

of corruptions not to be borne with and anti-christian, and especially the habits which the Clergy were enjoined to use in their conversation and ministration."—*Strype's Grindal, p.* 169. That the same feeling continued to exist till the reign of Charles I. may be seen from the Letter addressed by order of the House of Commons, to "the reformed Churches" of Zealand and Holland by the assembled divines, wherein it is admitted that then "*the contest was for a more thorough Reformation.*" And the adherents of the English Reformation are described as an "anti-christian faction, who have all along made it their business *to check the Reformation and cherish Popery.*" They add, in order to inflame the Dutch against the exiled English, "to make their aversion to you still more demonstrable, abundance of these men have refused to own any of you as a Christian Church, for being not prelatically constituted they conceive your ministrations want a lawful mission, which is essential to Church governors. And as for ourselves we are sadly sensible that in all these kingdoms they, (*i. e.* the clergy of the Church of England) have prevailed so far in promoting Popery and discouraging religion that it would require a volume, rather than a letter, to relate all particulars."—*Rushworth's Collections, part* iii. *page* 391.

In short, we may cite the authority of no less a person than Henderson, who, in his controversy with Charles I. asserts "that the Laodicean luke-

warmness in the English Reformation had been the constant complaint of many of the godly in this kingdom."—*Collier*, ii. 842.

Let this suffice to shew that whatever charges may be brought against those, against whom, under the name of High Churchmen, an attempt is now made to raise a moral persecution, they cannot, with propriety, be accused of deviating from the principles of the English Reformation. Of the English Reformers they are, in fact, the representatives, and it is precisely on the principles of the English Reformers that they oppose the errors both of Romanists and Ultra-protestants, and uphold "THE CHURCH OF THE TRADITIONERS."

NOTE E, page 17.

PROTESTANTS.

The designation of Protestant is used in England as a general term to denote all who protest against Popery. Such, however, was neither the original acceptation of the word, nor is it the sense in which it is still applied, on the continent. It was originally given to those who protested against a certain decree issued by the Emperor Charles V. and the Diet of Spires in 1529.—*Mosheim, Book* iv. 26. On the continent it is applied as a term to distinguish the Lutheran communions. The Lutherans are called Protestants; the Calvinists, the Reformed. The use of the word among our-

selves in a sense different from that adopted by our neighbours abroad has sometimes led to curious mistakes. The late Mr. Canning, for instance, in his zeal to support the Romanists, and not being sufficiently well instructed in the principles of the Church of England, assumed it as if it were an indisputable fact that, being Protestants, we must hold the doctrine of consubstantiation. Having consulted, probably, some foreign history of Protestantism, he found that one of the tenets which distinguishes the "Protestant," *i. e.* the Lutheran, from the "Reformed," *i. e.* the Calvinist, is that the former maintains, the latter denies, the dogma of consubstantiation.

It is evident that in *our* application of the word it is a mere term of negation. If a man says that he is a Protestant, he only tells us that he is *not* a Romanist,—at the same time he may be what is worse, a Socinian or even an Infidel, for these are all united under the common principle of protesting against Popery. The appellation is not given to us, I believe, in any of our formularies, and has chiefly been employed in political warfare as a watchword to rally in one band all who, whatever may be their religious differences, are prepared to act politically against the aggressions of the Romanists. In this respect it was particularly useful at the time of the Revolution, and, as politics intrude themselves into all the considerations of an Englishman, either directly or indirectly, the term is endeared to a powerful and influential

party in the State. But on the very ground that it thus keeps out of view distinguishing and vital principles, and unites in apparent agreement those who essentially differ, many of our divines object to the use of the word. They contend, with good reason, that it is quite absurd to speak of the Protestant *Religion*, since a religion must, of course, be distinguished not by what it renounces but by what it professes: they apprehend that it has occasioned a kind of sceptical habit, of inquiring not how much we ought to believe, but how much we may *refuse* to believe; of looking at what is negative instead of what is positive in our religion; of fearing to inquire after the truth lest it should lead to something which is held by the Papists in common with ourselves, and which, *therefore*, as some persons seem to argue, no sound Protestant can hold; forgetting that on this principle we ought to renounce the Liturgy, the Sacraments, the doctrine of the Trinity, the deity and atonement of Christ,—nay, the very Bible itself. It is on these grounds that the writers of the Oxford Tracts have scrupled to use the word, and hence they have brought down upon themselves the outpourings of the vials of wrath from all who are weak enough to prefer words to things, and especially from political divines, and men who would make religion merely an instrument to serve their political purposes. I make these observations the more freely because I differ in this respect from the writers of the Oxford

Tracts. It is certainly absurd to speak of the Protestant *religion*,—*i. e.* a negative religion, but there is no absurdity in speaking of the Church of England, or of the Church of America, as a Protestant *Church*—the word Church conveys a positive idea, and there can be no reason why we should not have *also* a negative appellation. If we admit that the Church of Rome is a true though a corrupt Church, it is well to have a term by which we may always declare that, while we hold in common with her all that she has which is Catholic, scriptural, and pure, we protest for ever against her multiplied corruptions. Besides, the word, whether correctly or not, is in general use, and is in a certain sense applicable to the Church of England; it is surely, therefore, better to retain it, only warning our congregations that when we call ourselves Protestants, we mean no more to profess that we hold communion with all parties who are so styled, than the Church of England, when in her creeds and formularies she designates herself not as the *Protestant* but as the *Catholic* Church of this country, intends to hold communion with those Catholic Churches abroad which have infused into their system the principles of the Council of Trent. Protestant is our negative, Catholic our definite name. We tell the Papist that with respect to him we are Protestant; we tell the Protestant Dissenter that with respect to him we are Catholics; and we may be called Protestant or Protesting Catholics, or as some of our writers describe us, Anglo-Catholics.

NOTE F, page 18.

THE ROMISH SCHISM.

Of this schism the following is a succinct and interesting account:

"Now at such time as *Button*, *Billingham*, and the rest of the *Puritan* faction had first made the schism, *Harding* and *Sanders*, and some others of the Popish fugitives, employed themselves as busily in persuading those of that religion to the like temptation. For being licensed by the Pope to exercise Episcopal jurisdiction in the realm of *England*, they take upon them to absolve all such in the Court of Conscience, who should return to the communion of the Church of *Rome;* as also to dispense in causes of irregularity, except it were incurred by wilful murther; and finally, from the like irregularities incurred by heresie, if the party who desired the benefit of the absolution, abstain'd from ministering at the holy altar for three years together, by means whereof, and the advantages before mentioned, which were given them by the *Puritan faction*, they drew many to them from the Church, both priests and people; their numbers every day increasing, as the scandal did. And finding how the sectaries enlarged their numbers by erecting a *French* Church in *London*, and that they were upon the point of procuring another for the use and comfort of the *Dutch*, they thought it no ill piece of wisdom to attempt the like in some convenient place near *England*, where they might train up their disciples, and fit them for employment upon all occasions. Upon which ground a seminary is established for them at *Douay*, in *Flanders*, *anno* 1568; and another not long after at *Rhemes*, a city of *Champaigne*, in the realm of *France*. Such was the benefit which redounded to the Church of *England* by the perverseness of the brethren of this first separation, that it occasioned the like schism betwixt her and the Papists, who till that time had kept themselves in her communion, as before was said. For that the Papists generally did frequent the Church in these first ten years, is positively affirmed by *Sir Edward Coke*, in his speech at the arraignment of *Garnet*, the Jesuit, and afterwards at the charge which was given by him at the general assizes held in *Norwich*. In both of which he speaks

on his own certain knowledge, not on vulgar hearsay; affirming more particularly that he had many times seen *Bedenfield, Cornwallis*, and some other of the leading *Romanists*, at the divine service of the Church, who afterwards were the first that departed from it. The like is averred by the most learned *Bishop Andrews*, in his book called *Tortura Torti*, *p.* 130, and there asserted undeniably against all opposition. And which may serve instead of all, we finde the like affirmed also by the Queen herself, in her instructions given to *Walsingham*, then being her Resident with the *French* King, *anno* 1570. In which instructions bearing date on the 11*th August*, it is affirmed expressly of the heads of that party, and therefore we may judge the like of the members also, that *they did ordinarily resort, from the beginning of her reign, in all open places, to the Churches, and to divine service in the Church, without any contradiction or shew of misliking.*

"The parallel goes further yet. For as the *Puritans* were encouraged to this separation by the Missals and Decretory Letters of *Theodore Beza*, whom they beheld as the chief Patriarch of their Church. So were the Papists animated to their defection by a Bull of *Pope Pius* V. whom they acknowledged most undoubtedly for the head of theirs. For the Pope being thrust on by the importunity of the House of *Guise*, in favour of the Queen of *Scots*, whose title they preferred before that of *Elizabeth*, and by the Court of *France*, in hatred to the Queen herself, for aiding the *French Hugonots* against their King, was drawn at last to issue out this Bull against her, dated at *Rome, Feb.* 24, 1569. In which Bull he doth not onely excommunicate her person, deprive her of her kingdoms, and absolve all her subjects from their oaths of allegiance; but commands all her subjects, of what sort soever, not to obey her laws, injunctions, ordinances, or acts of state. The defection of the Papists had before been voluntary, but is now made necessary; the Pope's command being superadded to the scandal which had before been given them by the *Puritan faction.* For after this the going or not going to Church was commonly reputed by them for a sign distinctive, by which a Roman Catholick might be known from an English heretick. And this appears most plainly by the preamble to the act of parliament *against bringing or executing of Bulls from Rome.*— 13 *Eliz.* 2. Where it is reckoned amongst the effects of those Bulls and writings, *That those who brought them, did by their*

lewd practices, and subtile perswasions, work so farforth, that sundry people, and ignorant persons, have been contented to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, *and to have withdrawn and absented themselves from all divine service, most godlily exercised in this realm.* By which it seems, that till the roaring of those Bulls, those of the Popish party did frequent the Church, though not so generally in the last five years (as our learned *Andrews* hath observed) as they did the first, before they were discouraged by the innovations of the *Puritan faction.*"

Heylin's History of the Presbyterians.
Lib. vi. *p.* 260.

Note G, p. 19.

On the charge of popery brought against the English reformers and the friends of the English reformation.

Against those Divines who uphold the system of the *English* as distinguished from that of the *Foreign* Reformation, it is sought to excite the odium of the ignorant, by designating them as Semi-papists, if not actually Papists in disguise. Doubtless they will rejoice to bear the scandal of the Cross, and to escape the woe denounced upon those of whom all men speak well. *Luke*, vi. 26. *See also John* xv. 19. They remember our Lord's Prophecy, *Mat.* x. 22. They care little if men "shall hate them, and separate them from their company, and reproach them, and cast out their name as evil." *Luke* vi. 22. They know that "if the world hate them, it hated their master before them." *John* xv. 18; and they "marvel not." 1 *John* iii. 13. But some consolation it is to know that they share these reproaches with the English

Reformers themselves, of whom some of their opponents say that they are their masters. We call no man master; but, certainly, if history be not an old almanac, the persecution which persons styled High Churchmen have to undergo, is inflicted merely because they act towards both the Romish and Protestant Dissenters, precisely as the English Reformers did, seeking neither unnecessarily to offend, nor, by sacrifice of principle, to conciliate.

In notes B and D many passages are adduced, which fully substantiate the assertion that the charge of Popery was brought as vehemently against the English Reformers as it is now against their representatives, the High Churchmen. We have seen how they were thus accused by Calvin, and that Beza declared that "Popery was never thrown out of the English Church, but rather transferred from his Holiness to her Majesty." In the same Letter, he remarks "that *those few ministers who come up to the purity of the gospel* are either thrown into prison or deprived both, unless they solemnly engage to go the utmost lengths of conformity, and resemble *Baal's priests*, in their square caps, tippets, and such sort of equipages."—*Collier*, ii. *p.* 503. The authorized version of Scripture was, as we have seen before, conducted on a principle of deference to the primitive Church. But the followers of the foreign Reformers not only translated the Scripture on different principles, but so far were they

from wishing to circulate the Bible without note or comment, that they published one in the early part of Elizabeth's reign, with notes, intending to inculcate the system of Calvin instead of that of the English Reformation. In 1560, says Collier, "the English translation of Scripture, commonly called the Geneva Bible, was published at Geneva. There are two epistles prefixed to the work, one to the Queen; the other to the reader. *These addresses charged the English Reformation with Remains of Popery*, and endeavoured to prevail with the Queen to strike off several ceremonies."—*Collier*, ii. 471. The fact, that they omitted these addresses in a subsequent edition, only shews that they found it *impolitic* to publish such charges, not that they intended to withdraw them: for the Popery of our Reformers was the very plea urged by the Puritans *out* of the Church to justify their secession, and by the Puritans *in* the Church for disobeying her regulations. The Protestation of the Puritans against the English Reformation thus commences: "Being thorough persuaded in my conscience by the working and the word of the Almighty, that *these relics of Antichrist* be abominable before the Lord our God; and also, for that by the power, mercy, strength, and goodness of the Lord our God only I am escaped from the filthiness and pollution of *these detestable traditions*.....I have joined in prayer and hearing God's word with those that have not yielded *to this idolatrous trash*, notwithstanding the danger

for not coming to my parish church, &c. therefore, I come not back again to the preaching, &c. of them *that have received these marks of the Romish beast.*" "They (the English Reformers) are *glad to strengthen the Papists in their errors, and grieve the Godly.*" "These *popish garments* are now become very idols indeed, because they are exalted above the word of the Almighty.....I come not to them (the English Reformers) because they should be ashamed, and so leave their idolatrous garments."—*Strype's Life of Abp. Parker*, ii. 283, 284. So also among the demands of the (so called) millenary petition, one was that "*no popish* opinion should be any more taught or defended. No ministers charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus."—*Strype's Life of Abp. Whitgift*, ii. 480. In "*The Plea of the Innocent*" those who adhered to the doctrines of the English Reformation as distinguished from the Puritans are called "sychophantizing *Papists*, statizing Priests.—*Ibid*, 479. In the "*Prayer of the Refusers of the Habits*," they assert that "those in power neglected that they ought to have done, to the hindrance of the course of the gospel; and that the *relics of Romish idolatry* was stoutly maintained." *Strype's Annals, Vol.* i. *pt.* 2. *p*, 168. In a work by Beale, which expressed the sentiments of the Puritans, Queen Elizabeth is spoken of as "a defendresse of beggarly, *popish*, and antichristian rites," and the ceremonies of the church are styled "beggarly, popish, and anti-christian." *Strype's Whitgift*, iii

87. We may barely give the titles of some of the books which were published at the completion of the English reformation, against our English Reformers; one was stlyed "*A view of Antichrist, his laws and ceremonies in our English Church unreformed; a clear glass wherein may be seen the dangerous and desperate diseases of our English Church, being utterly ready to perish, unless she speedily have a corrosive of the wholesome words of God, his word, laid very whot to her heart, to expulse those colds and deadly infections of Popery, which the tainted Poticaries of Antichrist have corrupted her withal.*" In this book there is a table, "of the displaying of the Pope and Popery in our Church of England. The Pope of Rome writeth himself Father of Fathers, and Head of the Church. The Pope of Canterbury writeth himself, reverend Father, Matthew of Canterbury, by the sufference of God," &c. Another book was styled "*A brief discourse against the outward apparel and ministering garments of the Popish Church*, i. e. *the Church of England.*" Another book was named "*A view of the Popish abuses yet remaining.*" Thomas Cartwright seems to have set the example in thus calling the English Reformers Papists, for he and his brethren "in dispute of the hierarchy, now begun commonly to call these Popes, and the Archbishops of Canterbury, Popes of Lambeth." *Strype's Parker*, ii. 203. In 1572 a committee of the House of Commons, desirous of furthering the

views of the Puritans, "thought it advisable that some of them should repair with their bills to the Archbishop, and perhaps others of the Bishops too.....The Archbishop (our great Reformer, Archbishop Parker,) signified his dislike of it; *since the ordinary course of redressing matters amiss in the Church did properly belong to the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation.*" After some discussion, the Archbishop replied, "Surely you mistook the matter: you will refer yourselves wholly to us therein." To which Mr. Wentworth, whom Strype describes as a hot gentleman, exclaimed, "No, by the faith I bear to God, we will pass nothing before we understand what it is. For that were to make you Popes. Make you Popes who list, for we will make you none." *Strype's Parker*, ii. 202. But perhaps the reader would like to know what were the deeds of Popery for which our high-church Reformers were styled, like their present representatives, Papists, and he will probably be surprised to hear that the charge of Popery was then made against almost every thing which a Churchman in these days reveres. Does the Churchman revere the Book of Common Prayer? "It is patched for the most part out of the Pope's *Portuise*: it is an imperfect book, culled and picked out of the *Popish* dunghill, the Mass Book, full of abominations." *Admonition to Parliament. Strype's Annals, Vol.* ii. *pt.* 2. 478. "The public prayers and worship of God, as it is by law in the Church of England established, is false,

superstitious, and *Popish*." *Strype, Ibid*, iv. 202. The Communion Service is spoken of in the same language; and the reading of the epistle and gospel in that office is "utterly misliked and called a Popish introit." *Strype* ii. *pt.* 2. 479. "For newly married persons to receive the communion is pronounced to be *Popish*, because in Popish times they had a mass." *Ibid.* 480. Is confirmation valued as a holy ordinance? It was called "superstitious, *Popish*, and peevish." *Ibid.* Are Cathedrals now supported? They come under the same category. *Ibid.* 477. There are no Churchmen in these days who do not consider episcopacy to be at least an apostolical ordinance. But it has been held that the names of Archbishops, Archdeacons, and Bishops, Chancellors, &c. are drawn out of the Pope's shop, together with these offices. And it was urged against our Reformers "that the government of the Church of England, as it is now established, is no lawful government, but Antichristian and Popish." *Strype*, iv. 202.

The same charge of Popery was brought against the Church of England and her Reformers at the Hampton Court Conference. Among other marks of *Popery* was our retension of the sign of the cross.

"Whereunto the King's Majesty answered divers ways:—First, quoth he, tho I be sufficiently persuaded of the cross in Baptism, and the commendable use thereof in the Church so long; yet if there were nothing else to move me, this very argument were an inducement to me for the retaining of it, as it is now by order establish'd. For inasmuch as it was abused, so you say, to

superstition in time of Popery, it doth plainly imply, that it was well used before Popery. I will tell you. I have lived among this sort of men (speaking to the Lords and Bishops) ever since I was ten years old; but I may say of myself, as Christ did of himself, tho 'I lived among them, yet since I had ability to judge, I was never of them; neither did any thing make me more to condemn and detest their courses, than that they did so peremptorily disallow of all things, which at all had been used in Popery. For my part, I know not how to answer the objection of the Papists, when they charge us with novelties; but truly to tell them, that their abuses are new, but the things which they abused we retain in their primitive use, and forsake only the novel corruption. By this argument we might renounce the Trinity, and all that is holy, because it was abused in Popery; and (speaking to *Dr. Reynolds* merrily) they used to wear hose and shoes in Popery, therefore we shall now go barefoot.

"'Secondly, quoth his Majesty, what resemblance is there between the brazen serpent, a material visible thing, and the sign of the cross made in the air?

"'Thirdly, I am given to understand by the Bishops, and I find it true, that the Papists themselves did never ascribe any power or spiritual grace to the sign of the cross in Baptism.

"'Fourthly, you see that the material crosses, which, in the time of Popery, were made for men to fall down before them, as they passed by them, to worship them (as the idolatrous *Jews* did the brazen serpent) are demolished as you desire.'

"The next thing which was objected was the wearing of the surplice, a kind of garment which the priests of *Isis* used to wear. 'Surely,' saith his Majesty, 'till of late I did not think it had been borrowed from the heathen, because it is commonly term'd *a rag of Popery,* in scorn; but were it so, yet neither did we border upon heathenish nations, neither are any of them conversant with us, or commorant amongst us, who thereby might take just occasion to be strengthen'd or confirm'd in Paganism; for then there were just cause to suppress the wearing it: but seeing it appear'd out of antiquity, that in the celebration of divine service, a different habit appertaineth to the ministry, and principally of white linen, he saw no reason, but that in this Church, as it had been for comeliness and for order sake, it might still be continued. This being his constant and

resolute opinion, that no Church ought farther to separate itself from the Church of *Rome,* either in doctrine or ceremony, than she had departed from herself, when she was in her flourishing and best estate, and from Christ her Lord and head."

Barlow's account of the Hampton Court Conference in the Phenix, i. 166.

The mode of reasoning on this matter, adopted by his Majesty, was referred to, and has received the sanction of the Church of England in the 30th canon before quoted.

This charge has, indeed, always been adduced to persecute into silence those of our divines who have endeavoured to uphold the principles of the English Reformers, which they contend are equally the principles of sound reasoning, catholicism, and Scripture. Of honoured names the Church of England holds none more highly in honour than that of the judicious Hooker.

"Hooker may justly be regarded as the genuine lineal descendant of the most enlightened English Reformers, and possessing learning equal to that of any of them, with more opportunities for meditation, and the accumulated advantage of their labours and experience, he may, perhaps not improperly, be considered as exhibiting in his writings a model of the true, settled, most improved, mature, and Catholic principles of the English Reformation. But these virtues did not screen him from having many adversaries. At the time when Hooker wrote, Calvinism, *doctrinal* as well as *disciplinarian*, had made considerable progress in England; and Hooker's, unhappily for his own peace of mind, were almost the only works of great extent which were calculated to arrest the progress of the doctrinal Calvinists. In the year 1599 a tract was published in 4to. entitled *A Christian Letter of certaine English Protestants, unfaigned favourers of the present state of religion, authorised and professed in England, unto that reverend and learned man, Mr. R. Hooker, requiring resolution in certaine matters of*

doctrine, (which seeme to overthrow the foundation of Christian religion, and of the Church among us) expresslie contained in his five books of Ecclesiasticall Polity. This book is one of the earliest productions of those mal-contents, who were afterwards called *doctrinal Puritans.* It is the *doctrines* of Hooker with which they quarrel; and they profess (in contradistinction to the abettors of the *Geneva discipline*) an unfeigned attachment to the external establishments of the Church of England The work is further deserving of notice, as exhibiting, I believe, the earliest example, both in the matter and manner of the argument, of those numerous publications in which some Calvinistic writers have thoughtlessly and intemperately indulged themselves, from the days of this Christian letter, and from Prynne, and Hickman, downwards, to Edwards, and Toplady, and Bowman, and Sir Richard Hill, and Overton. Can it be believed, the authors of the letter in question tax the meek, the wise, the virtuous, the saint-like Richard Hooker with betraying and renouncing the doctrines to which he had solemnly subscribed? *They charge him with designs of bringing back Popery.* They accuse him of a wanton attack on the memory of Calvin. They condemn him of unsoundness of doctrine respecting grace, and freewill, and justification, and predestination, and the *conditions* of the Christian covenant, and the sacraments of the Christian Church. It is curious to see the Thirty-nine Articles, the Liturgy, the Homilies, Bishop Jewell's Apology, Dean Nowell's Catechism, and the writings of many others of Hooker's Protestant predecessors, solemnly cited against him, and confronted in due form with extracts from the Ecclesiastical Polity, for the purpose of convicting him of deserting and denying the principles of that Church of which he was a minister, in whose cause he toiled day and night, and in the defence of which, I believe, it may truly be said, that it was God's good pleasure that he should die."

Wordsworth's Biography, iv. 269.

From the performance here referred to, we may give the following extracts very much in the temper and spirit of our own times.

"In all your books—reason is highlie sett up against Holie Scripture, *and reading against preaching; the Church of Rome favourablie admitted to be of the House of God:* Calvin with the

Reformed Churches full of faults, and most of all they which endeavoured to be *most reformed from conformity with the Church of Rome:* allmost all the principall points of our English creede greatly shaken and contradicted. If you do not sincerely, plainlie, and trulie answer all these our necessary doubts and demandes, what shall we have cause to think of these your tedious and laborious writings? Shall we do you wrong to suspect you as a privie and subtile enemy of the English Church, and that would have men to deeme her Majesty to have done ill in abolishing *the Romish Religion,* and banishing the Popes' authority. Will you bring us *to Atheisme or Popery?—P.* 43. "You make it—the Sacrament,—a means conditional and no less required than faith itself. And herein we are suitors unto you to tell us, whether the condition of Sacraments make not for the additament of works unto faith, in that which the English Church holdeth to be only and properlie of *faith.*"—*P.* 28.

Even good Bishop Hall did not escape the charge. Sanderson, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, in that part of the famous Preface to his Sermons, bearing date July 13, 1657, in which he shews the advantages which the Puritan writers gave to the Romish party, by the unsoundness of their reasonings, and their extreme intolerance, and the much greater progress which Popery was making in England towards the latter end of the Commonwealth, through their incapacity, than it had ever done before, remarks that

"They promoted the interest of Rome, and betrayed the Protestant cause, partly by *mistaking the question,* (a very common fault among them) but especially through the necessity of some *false principle* or other, which, having once imbibed, they think themselves bound to maintain. Among those false principles it shall suffice for the present to have named but this one, *That the Church of Rome is no true Church.* The disadvantages of which assertion to our cause in the dispute about *the visibility of the Church* (besides the falseness and uncharitableness of it) their

zeal, or prejudice rather, will not suffer them to consider. With what outcries was Bishop Hall, good man, (who little dreamt of *any peace with Rome*) pursued by Burton and other Hotspurs, for yielding it a Church! who had made the same concession over and over again before he was Bishop (as Junius, Reynolds, and our best controversy writers generally do,) and no notice was taken, no noise made about it."—*Page* 79, *edit.* 1689. *Wordsworth's Biography*, v. 305.

Bishop Hall himself says,

"I adventured to set my pen on work; desiring to rectify the opinions of those men whom an ignorant zeal had transported, to the prejudice of our holy cause, laying forth the damnable corruptions of the Romish Church, yet making our game of the outward visibility thereof, and by this means putting them to the probation of those newly obtruded corruptions which are truly guilty of the breach betwixt us; the drift whereof, being not well conceived, by some spirits that were not so wise as fervent, I was suddenly exposed to the rash censures of many well affected and zealous Protestants, as if I had, in a remission to my wonted zeal to the truth, attributed too much to the Roman Church, and strengthened the adversaries' hand, and weakened our own. This envy I was fain to take off by my speedy Apologetical Advertisement, and after that by my Reconciler, seconded with the unanimous letters of such reverend, learned, and sound divines, both bishops and doctors, as whose undoubtable authority was able to bear down calumny itself. Which done, I did by a seasonable moderation provide for the peace of the Church, in silencing both my defendants and challengers, in this unkind and illraised quarrel."—*Wordsworth's Biography*, v. *p.* 305.

The name of Bishop Sanderson reminds me of a passage from his works applicable to this subject with which I will conclude this note. Bishop Sanderson is the author of "The General Thanksgiving" in the Prayer Book, and therefore advice from him will be favorably received.

"But *their opinion* is, that the things enjoyned are *Popish* and *superstitious*, and consequently *unlawful* to be used: and

this they render as the *reason* of their *non-conformity*. And the *reason* were certainly good if the *opinion* were true. For the *Popishness* first; unless we should sue out a writ *de finibus regendis*, it will be hard to find out a way how to bring this *controversie* to an *issue*, much less to an end: the *term* hath been so strangely extended, and the *limits* thereof (if yet it have any) so *uncertain*. If they would be intreated to set bounds to what they mean by *Popish* and Popery, by giving us a certain *definition of it*, we should the sooner either come to some *agreement;* or, at least, understand ourselves and one another the better, wherein and how far we *disagreed*. In the meantime it is to me a wonder, that if *reason* would not heretofore, yet the sad *experience* of the ill consequents, so *visible* of late time, should not have taught them all this while to *consider* what infinite *advantage* they give to the *Romish party* to work upon *weak* and *wavering* souls; by damning so many things under the name of *Popery*, which may to their understandings be sufficiently evidenced, some, to have been used by the *ancient Christians* long before *Popery* was hatched, or but in the egg; and *all* to have nothing of *superstition* or *Popery* in them, unless every thing that is used in the *Church of Rome* become thereby *Popish* and *superstitious*. Nor what great *advantage* they give to our newer *sectaries*, to extend the name yet farther; who, by the help of their *new lights*, can discern *Popery*, not only in the *ceremonies* formerly under debate, but even in the *Churches* and *pulpits* wherein they used to preach against *Popery*, and the *bells* wherewith they used to call the people together to hear them. These are by some of them cryed down as Popish, with other things very many, which their *Presbyterian* brethren do *yet* both allow and practise; though *how long* they will so do, is uncertain, if they go on with the work of *Reformation* they have begun, with as *quick dispatch*, and at the rate they have done these last *two seven* years. The having of *Godfathers* at Baptism, *churching* of women, *prayers* at the burial of the dead, children asking their parents' *blessing*, &c. which whilome were held *innocent;* are now by very many thrown aside as rags of *Popery*. Nay, are not some gone so far already, as to cast into the same heap, not only the ancient hymn *Gloria Patri* (for the repeating whereof alone some have been *deprived* of all their *livelihoods*) and the *Apostles' Creed;*

but even the use of the *Lord's Prayer itself?* And what will *ye do* in the end thereof! And what would ye have *us do* in the mean time, when ye call hard upon us to leave our *Popery*, and yet you would never do us the favour to let us know what it is? It were good, therefore, both for *your own* sakes, that you may not rove *in infinitum;* and in compassion *to us*, that you would give us a perfect *boundary* of what is *Popery* now; with some *prognostication* or *ephemerides* annexed (if you please) whereby to *calculate* what will be Popery seven years hence.—*Bp. Sanderson, 2nd Preface to his Sermons.*

"It is not my purpose, nor is this a place for it, to make any large discovery of *the cause* of *the mistake*, the unsoundness of the *tenent* itself, and how pernicious it is in the consequents. Yet I cannot but humbly and earnestly entreat them, for the love of *God* and the comfort of their *own souls:* as they tender the peace of *the Church* and the honour of *our religion;* and in compassion to thousands *of their Christian brethren*, who are otherwise in great danger to be either *misled* or *scandalized:* that they would think it possible for *themselves* to be mistaken in their *principle*, as well as others, and possible also for those *principles* they rest upon to have some *frailties* and infirmities in them, though not hitherto by them *adverted*, because never *suspected;* that therefore they would not hasten *to their conclusion* before they are well assured of the *premises*, nor so freely bestow the name of *Popish* or *superstitious* upon the *opinions or actions* of their brethren, as they have used to do, before they have first and thoroughly *examined* the solidity of their own grounds. Finally, and in order thereto, that they would not therefore despise the offer of these few things to their consideration, because tendered by one that standeth better affected to their persons than their opinions."—*Bp. Sanderson's First Preface to his Sermons.*

Note H. p. 21.

SOCINIANS.

Of a truth the Socinian, or "Unitarian" as he denominates himself, meets with hard measure from his brethren among the Ultra-protestants.

He protests most loudly against Popery. He takes the Bible and the Bible only for his guide. He affirms that in the Bible, interpreted according to the best of his ability, he cannot discover those great doctrines which we, of the Church of England, know to be the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. He is wrong, and we of the Church of England anathematize him and refuse to regard him as a Christian. And so do many of the Ultra-protestant sects who hold, in fact, with us, the great fundamentals of Christianity. But on their own principles what right can they have to do so? Of what crime has he, on their principles, been guilty? At the very most, he can only be guilty, as is stated above, of an obtuseness of intellect which has led to bad logic or to bad criticism. But, after all, for the Ultra-protestant to assert that the Socinian interprets Scripture wrongly is only to beg the very point in dispute. The Socinian says, "I receive Scripture in what I believe to be the true sense, and so do you;—we differ as to what the true sense is, but this is only a difference of opinion, and you have no more right to blame *me* than I have to blame *you*." We of the Church of England, while we defer to Scripture only, profess to receive Scripture as the Church always understood it, and, by public documents in general councils, asserted its belief. We there have an arbiter to decide, when two meanings can be attached to one passage of Scripture, which to adopt, our object being not to

ascertain what Scripture can be *made* to say, but what the Lord our God actually means. But for this, Ultra-protestants denounce us as papistical and call our Church *the Church of the Traditioners*. They therefore are ex hypothesi excluded from this mode of arguing. We rejoice to find that they agree with us whenever they *do* agree. But we marvel when we hear them joining with us in censuring "Unitarianism" as a heresy.

Note I, p. 21.

PERSECUTION BY ULTRA-PROTESTANTS.

A violent and popular outcry has often been raised against the Church because, at the Restoration, those of the clergy who refused to conform were ejected from their benefices. But it will be well to see how the case really stands. *Seven thousand* English clergymen, having refused to take the Covenant at the great Rebellion, were ejected from their livings, their places being supplied by dissenting teachers. This most honourable testimony to the clergy of the Church of England at that period ought never to be forgotten. At the Restoration it was required that all those persons who had thus become possessed of the property of the English Church should either conform to the regulations of the Church or resign. Of all the Puritan clergy then in possession, only two thousand thought fit to resign rather than comply. And these two thousand

were ejected from what? From their rights? No, but from their usurpations. Five thousand conformed and still retained possession of the Church property, so that many of the previously ejected clergy of the Church of England who hoped, at the Restoration, to be restored to their own, were sorely disappointed and cruelly used. The treatment of the English clergy by the Presbyterians is worthy of notice.

"The taking of the Covenant was now press'd close through all the parliament quarters, which brought a terrible persecution upon the loyal clergy. Those who refus'd to comply were turn'd out of their houses, and not suffer'd to compound either for personal or real estate. This rigour forc'd great numbers of the clergy to quit their benefices, and retire to places under the King's protection. These *vacancies* were partly supply'd by those *Presbyterians* who had formerly been *lecturers* or chaplains; partly by young unqualify'd students from the Universities. To which we may add, some refugees from *Scotland* and *New England;* who came in for their share of preferment. And some of those Puritans, who had formerly declaim'd so much against *pluralities*, were now reconcil'd to the holding two or three livings. As to the honest clergy, who refus'd to joyn the rebellion, or revolt from the church, they were sequester'd and imprison'd; and almost every way harass'd and undone. From the year 1641 to six years forward, there were an hundred and fifteen clergymen turn'd out of their livings within the *bills of mortality;* most of these were plunder'd, and their wives and children set in the streets. By these barbarities at *London,* the *reader* may conjecture the greatness of the calamity in the rest of the kingdom.

"They had another way of reaching the orthodox clergy beside the Covenant: Some of them were sequester'd and ejected upon pretence of scandal and immorality. But to shew the iniquity of their proceedings upon this head, it may be observ'd first, that some of the crimes charg'd upon them were capital:

and therefore, since the forfeiture of their lives was not taken, we may reasonably believe the proof was defective. *Secondly*, the depositions against them were seldom taken upon oath, but bare affirmation went for evidence. *Thirdly*, many of the complainants were apparently factious men who had deserted the Church, and profess'd an aversion to the *hierarchy*. *Fourthly*, many of these pretended criminals were ignorantly if not maliciously charg'd with delivering false doctrine: For instance, some were prosecuted for preaching that *Baptism washes away original sin*: And *lastly*, many were outed for *malignancy*; that is, for being true to their allegiance. In short, 'tis observ'd there were more turn'd out of their livings by the *Presbyterians* in three years, than were depriv'd by the Papists in Queen *Mary's* reign; or had been *silenc'd*, *suspended*, or *depriv'd* by all the bishops from the first year of Queen *Elizabeth* to the time we are upon. *Collier* ii. 828.

The Independents, who burned some hundreds for witchcraft, and hanged the Quakers in Massachusets, "proposed more massacres than they executed. There was one of all the Royalists or Presbyterians in the true Marat style of taking two hundred thousand heads off at one stroke."—*D'Israeli's Charles I.* iii. 295.

I do not refer to these things to revive angry and useless disputes; and I am perfectly aware that no Dissenters, whether Romish or Protestant, would wish to revive a spirit of persecution, now that the principle of toleration is fully understood, but when attempts are so frequently made, by stating only one side of the question, to make it appear that Dissenters were hardly used by Churchmen in times past, it becomes necessary to shew that we have it in our power, by an appeal to history, to exhibit the other side of the picture, and to make it known, that the little finger of an Ultra-

protestant is thicker than a Churchman's loins. I believe the first declarations in favor of a toleration are to be found in Chillingworth and Jeremy Taylor.

Note K, p. 22.

THE OXFORD TRACTS.

That the simplification of our principle, alluded to in the text, has sometimes tended to narrow the mind, and that men have been inclined to support the Church of England on grounds and with feelings purely sectarian, may be lamented but can scarcely be denied. But still, generally speaking, the simplicity of our principle has worked well, and in every controversy its tendency is to bring Churchmen to an agreement. For instance, at the commencement of the last century, the tendency of Ultra-protestantism was to Socinianism. The Ultra-protestant sects in Germany and even in Geneva, had become Socinian. Under the influence of Hoadley and the then liberal party in England, an attempt was made to gain a footing for this God-denying heresy in the English Church. To believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, to worship the Saviour, or to regard the sacraments as any thing more than mere ceremonies, was represented as "flat Popery"; to condemn those who *protested* against these doctrines was considered "a renunciation of the fundamental principles of the Reformation." But the attempt failed, for every

man endowed with common honesty could understand the argument, "You may, if you like it, leave the Church, but you cannot, as an honest man continue to act therein as a minister, if you deny the truth of her doctrines, and it is impossible to doubt as to what her doctrines are with reference to the Holy Trinity and the Deity of our Lord." However liberal a man may be in the present day, he would not dare to avow Socinian opinions, (knowing them to be such,) and retain any official situation in the Church.

The tendency of the principle mentioned above to promote unanimity and concord among Churchmen, may be seen in another instance. In the middle of the last century it is not to be denied that a religious apathy prevailed, both in the Church and among the Sectarians, to a very considerable extent. We know both from their writings and their biographies, that there were a vast number of orthodox clergymen steadily performing their duty in their respective cures, but from a variety of circumstances, there was a vast number also, too inactive. Discipline, too, had relaxed. Bishops had been appointed whose political sentiments accorded ill with those of the great body of the Clergy, by whom they were regarded with suspicion and jealousy. The episcopal government is paternal, and where, from any cause, it cannot be administered with a paternal spirit, any legal powers with which our Bishops may be invested, as they cannot be exercised

without harshness, can scarcely be exercised at all. At this juncture, a zeal almost amounting to enthusiasm was kindled in the bosoms of many devout and excellent men, who felt called upon to blow the trumpet in Zion, and to awaken the sleeping world around them to a sense of their spiritual wants. The movement was simultaneous or nearly so in the Church and among the sectarians.* But the churchmen uniting with the sectarians, and thinking that excitement was the thing most needed, became attached to the system of the *foreign* rather than to that of the *English* Reformation. It is impossible to speak of such men as Venn, and Romaine, and Adam, and soon after, the Stillingfleets, Newton, and Joseph Milner, without feelings of affection, veneration, and respect. But one is surprised that they did not at once perceive the false position in which they frequently placed themselves by their daring violation of the regulations of the Church. In the case of Mr. Venn, he even went so far, upon his departure from Huddersfield, as to sanction the proceedings of his congregation, in deserting the Church and erecting a meeting-house, because the opinions of his successor did not entirely accord with his own. (*Life, p.* 174.)† Of course,

* It is clearly shewn by Mr. Venn, (preface to Venn's Life,) that the early "Evangelicals" in the Church were not indebted, even indirectly, as it has been sometimes misrepresented, to the Wesleys or Whitfield, for the sentiments by which they were influenced.

† Mr. Venn also went so far as to officiate in dissenting meeting-houses, and in London would sometimes preach in Rowland Hill's chapel. The very fact that his excellent son, the Rev. John Venn,

their irregular proceedings were noticed, and they became gradually sensible that if they continued to officiate in the Church, to the doctrines and regulations of the Church they were bound to defer. Towards the close of their career, their irregularities accordingly decreased. And the next generation of "Evangelicals" assumed another attitude; they contended against the "orthodox," as the great body of the clergy were styled, that their views were strictly those of the English Church and the English Reformation. The controversy thus assumed a definite and tangible form, according to the principle already alluded to. The appeal to this principle led, of course, to various explanations and various modifications of extreme opinions. The spirit of deference to the authoritative decisions of the Church of England was in his later years encouraged by Mr. Wilberforce, when that highly-gifted, amiable, and pious man had become virtually the leader of the "Evangelical" party: and at length the moderate of that party were found to be disputing with those who professedly adhered to the principles of the English Reformers and the Catholic Church, which had been consistently maintained by such men as Jones of Nayland, Bishop Horne, and their successors, merely about words. At such a time—when all parties, having admitted that

thought it necessary, when stating the circumstance, to add his own disapprobation of it, and to inform the reader that Mr. Venn himself, in his later years, lamented his irregularity in this instance, will, of itself, substantiate all that is asserted above.—*p.* 176.

Church principles ought to be carried out and uniformly acted upon, were led to inquire, 'what *are* Church principles? is *any* party acting consistently upon them?'—at such a time, the celebrated Oxford Tracts made their appearance. The reputed writers of the Tracts were men of ardent piety, who had been attached to the "Evangelical" school, and it was among the young men who had been educated in that school that they created a strong sensation. Hence, perhaps, the bitterness with which they are assailed by some of the older partizans of that section in the Church. To those who, like the present writer, had been educated strictly in principles of the English Reformation, and belonged to the old orthodox school, they brought forward nothing new, and though we may have demurred to some of their *opinions*, and have thought that, in some things, they are in an extreme, we rejoiced to see right principles advocated in a manner so decided, and in a spirit so truly Christian. Against some of the pious opinions supported in these Tracts, objections may occasionally be raised, for perfect coincidence of opinion is not to be expected. I do not, myself, accord with *all* the opinions expressed in them, or always admit the deduction attempted to be drawn from the principles on which we are are agreed. I think, too, that while manfully vindicating the principles of the English Reformation, in their fear lest they should appear to respect persons too highly, the writers of the

Tracts do not appreciate highly enough the character of some of our leading Reformers, or make due allowance for the difficulties in which they were placed. I mention these things the rather, since I am sure the writers in question have no wish to form a party; they have no wish to check freedom of opinion within the boundaries prescribed by the Church:—their object is only to imbue the public mind with those Catholic principles by the maintenance of which the English Reformation was gloriously distinguished. This cannot be done, unless on those principles opinions are formed, and from them conclusions drawn; and at the very time that we may combat a particular opinion, if we admit the truth of the principle on which it is built, we only confirm the principle, and impress it more deeply on men's minds. I am *not* one of those who would say, "Read the Oxford Tracts, and take for granted every opinion there expressed," but I *am* one of those who would say "Read and digest those Tracts well, and you will have imbibed principles which will enable you to judge of opinions." Their popularity will increase, since their arguments are not answered, or their statements refuted:—they are opposed simply by railing. And those who judge of such things only by second-hand reports, and garbled quotations, and anonymous misrepresentations in newspapers, will, of course, rail on. May the day come when they may be awakened to a sense of the danger of thus

violating the golden rule of charity! In the meantime the wise, the candid, those who are not the mere *partisans* of religion, but really religious, will themselves read the Tracts,—and if they *do* read they will commend. They may censure particular *opinions*, but they will commend the *whole*. At all events, the scriptural Christian will be *prejudiced* in favour of the writers of the Oxford Tracts, on seeing the fruits of the Spirit beautifully exhibited in their conduct, *love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness*; it would be well, indeed, if their assailants, in various magazines and newspapers, would remember of what *emulations, wrath, strife, seditions*, are the signs. The temper manifested by their opponents is as impolitic as it is too often profane: fully aware that it is not by reviling again, that they are to maintain the cause of a reviled and crucified Master; fully aware that it is by well-doing that they are "to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men," the writers of the Oxford Tracts, when assailed as "popish fanatics," &c. when their doctrines, instead of being refuted, are declaimed against as "figments of the darkest ages of Papal superstition," &c. calmly reply, "Brave words, surely! Well and good, take your fill of them, since you choose them for your portion. It does but make *our* spirits rise cheerily and hopefully to be thus encountered. Never were such words on one side, but *deeds* were on the other. We know our place and our fortunes; to

give a witness and to be contemned; to be ill-used and to *succeed*. Such is the law which God has annexed to the promulgation of the truth; its preachers suffer, but its cause prevails. Be it so. Joyfully will we consent to this compact. And the more you attack us personally, the more, for the very omen's sake, we will exult in it."

Note L, p. 26.

ON THE SACRAMENTS.

"In all ages the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the sacraments but lightly, as to be empty and bare signs." —*Bp. Latimer in Ridley's Life of Ridley, p.* 453.

1. Baptism.—So evidently does the Church connect Baptism and Regeneration that the Puritans in Queen Elizabeth's time and the Nonconformists in the reign of Charles II. justified their secession on the ground that "*the Church clearly teaches the doctrine of real baptismal regeneration.*"—*Nonconformist's Memorial. Introduct. p.* 39.

The Puritans particularly objected to our service for applying John iii. 5, to "*the baptizing in the font, that being spoken, as they said, only of the operation of the spirit.—Puritan Register, p.* 97. They cavilled also "at these words used in baptism, that Jesus Christ did sanctify the flood Jordan and all other waters to the mystical washing away of sin; as though we should attribute that to the sign which is proper to the word of God

in the blood of Christ; and that virtue were in the water to wash away sin."—"*A view of Popish abuses yet remaining.*" *Strype's Annals, vol.* ii. *pt.* 2. p. 480.

Allusion is here evidently made to our baptismal service where it is expressly said that water is sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin. The Puritans also objected to the Church for teaching each baptized child to speak of himself as "*sanctified,*" which is done in the catechism.

Among the eight things at the Savoy conference charged upon the Church as "flatly sinful and contrary to the word of God," the fourth was "*that ministers are obliged to pronounce all baptized infants regenerate by the Holy Ghost.*" *Collier* ii. 885. The Rev. Thos. Scott observes,

"Indeed the Fathers, as they are called, (that is the teachers of the Christian Church during some ages after the apostles,) soon began to speak on this subject in unscriptural language"—(i. e. according to Mr. Scott's idea of what scriptural language is, but he is no more infallible than the Fathers who were deep students of Scripture): "and *our pious reformers from an undue regard to them and to the circumstances of the times, have retained a few expressions in the Liturgy which not only are inconsistent with their other doctrine,* but also tend to perplex men's minds and mislead their judgment on this important subject. It is obvious, however, from their words above cited and many other passages, (particularly the articles on the sacraments) that they never supposed the mere outward administration of baptism to be regeneration, in the strict sense of the word."

Essays by the late Rev. Thos. Scott. Essay 12, *p.* 137.

This is certainly a curious sentence to be written by one who had subscribed his unfeigned assent and consent to the Prayer Book; and Mr. Scott's ideas of piety must have been peculiar.

According to his statement, our Reformers did not believe baptism to be regeneration, but yielding to "the circumstances of the time" and "*an undue regard to the Fathers*," they suffered what they did not believe to remain as the doctrine of the baptismal office, though leading, as Mr. Scott would consider, to errors the most pernicious and fatal. This, a High Churchman, who, true to the principles of the English Reformation, has a *due* regard for the Fathers, would, I shrewdly suspect, call impiety. From this charge I shall be happy to vindicate our great reformers: and first of Cranmer. That his private views were not, as Mr. Scott suspects, different from those which he publicly avowed, may be seen from the ensuing extract from one of his last and most elaborate works, the very title of which betrays a respect, whether due or undue, for the Fathers, sufficient to shew, in addition to what has before been produced, that, whatever anathemas they deserve who in these days have respect to the Fathers, it is presuming rather too much on the ignorance and credulity of the public to accuse them of deviating from the principles of the Reformation.

"A Defence of the true and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, with a Confutation of sundry errors concerning the same, grounded and stablished upon God's Holy Word, and approved by *the consent of the most ancient doctors* of the Church, made by the most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan."

"Although our carnal generation and our carnal nourishment be known to all men by daily experience and by our common

senses; yet this our spiritual generation and our spiritual nutrition be so obscure and hid unto us, that we cannot attain to the true and perfect knowledge and feeling of them, but only by faith, which must be grounded upon God's most holy word and sacraments.

"And for this consideration our Saviour Christ hath not only set forth these things most plainly in his holy word, that we may hear them with our ears; but he hath also ordained one visible sacrament *of spiritual regeneration in water*, and another visible sacrament of spiritual nourishment in bread and wine, to the intent that, as much as is possible for man, we may see Christ with our eyes, smell him at our nose, taste him with our mouths, grope him with our hands, and perceive him with all our senses. For as the word of God preached putteth Christ into our ears, so likewise the elements of water, bread, and wine, joined to God's word, do after a sacramental manner put Christ into our eyes, mouths, hands, and all our senses.

"And for this cause Christ ordained Baptism in water, that *as sure as we see, feel, and touch water with our bodies, and be washed with water;* so assuredly ought we to believe, when we be baptized, that Christ is verily present with us, *and that by him we be newly born again spiritually, and washed from our sins, and grafted in the stock of Christ's own body,* and be apparelled, clothed, and harnessed with him in such wise, that as the Devil hath no power against Christ, so hath he none against us, so long as we remain grafted in that stock, and be clothed with that apparel, and harnessed with that armour."

Cranmer's Works, ii. 302.

Of the force of this passage we have indirect evidence in the fact that when the Religious Tract Society undertook the re-publication of the greater part of the "Defence," the passage just quoted was carefully omitted. "Their extracts," says Mr. Jenkyns, "are much too imperfect to convey a full and fair view of Cranmer's tenets, especially as *they do not include a remarkable passage in his first book, illustrative of his opinions on Baptism.*"

The passage alluded to is the one quoted above. Now it cannot be supposed that the Religious Tract Society, &c. published the tract in question, antiquated in style and controversial in manner, as being in itself peculiarly adapted to those whom the Society is intended to benefit. The object was, of course, to insinuate that the principles of the Society are in accordance with those of the English Reformers. But on one of the most important points, the principles of the Tract Society, and those of Archbishop Cranmer, are very decidedly at variance. On what principle, then, can such an *unnoticed* omission be justified; an omission that leads the reader to infer that the Archbishop and the Society are perfectly in union? When Bishop Sanderson's advice is followed, and we have a clear definition of what Popery is, perhaps we shall find this noted as a Popish transaction. For although I am quite sure that truly pious Romanists would disdain such an artifice as this, yet of similar offences some of their most distinguished controversialists have been guilty.

But if a yet stronger passage from Archbishop Cranmer is wanted, it can easily be produced.

"And when you say that *in baptism we receive the spirit of Christ, and in the sacrament of his body and blood we receive his very flesh and blood*, this your saying is no small derogation to baptism, wherein we receive not only the spirit of Christ, but *also Christ himself, whole body and soul, manhood and Godhead, unto everlasting life*, as well as in the holy communion. For St. Paul saith, *Quicunque in Christo baptizati estis, Christum induistis, As many as be baptised in Christ, put Christ upon*

them. Nevertheless this is done in divers respects; for *in baptism it is done in respect of regeneration*, and in the holy communion in respect of nourishment and augmentation." *Works* iii. 65.

That they against whom, under the name of High-Churchmen, an attempt is made to excite the wrath of the irritable and the indignation of the ignorant, are influenced by the spirit of our English Reformers, no better proof can be given than their desire to circulate the authoritative documents of the Reformation. Some tracts of great importance under the title of "Tracts of the Anglican Fathers," have been lately published, and ought to be widely circulated. From Archbishop Cranmer's sermon on Holy Baptism, the following extracts are made:—

"And the second birth is by the water of Baptism, which Paul calleth the bath of regeneration, *because our sins be forgiven us in Baptism, and the Holy Ghost is poured into us as into God's beloved children, so that by the power and working of the Holy Ghost we be born again spiritually, and made new creatures.* And so by Baptism we enter into the kingdom of God, and are saved for ever if we continue to our lives' end in the faith of Christ." *p.* 1.

"When we are born again by Baptism, then our sins are forgiven us, and the Holy Ghost is given us, which doth make us also holy, and doth move us to all goodness." *p.* 7.

To this we may add the following parallel passage from one of our Homilies:—

"We must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Jesus the Son of God once offered for us on the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, *as well of our original sin in* Baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us after our Baptism, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to him again."

The second part of the Sermon of Salvation. See also *The first Homily of the Passion.*

But to return to Cranmer,

"Baptism is not water alone, and nothing else besides, but is the water of God, and hath his strength by the Word of God, and is a seal of God's promise. Wherefore, it doth work in us all those things whereunto God hath ordained it. For our Lord Jesus Christ saith, "Go and teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." This God commanded his disciples to do. Wherefore, by the virtue of this commandment, which came from heaven, even from the bosom of God, Baptism doth work in us, as the work of God. For when we be baptized in the name of God, that is as much [as] to say, as God himself should baptize us. Wherefore we ought not to have an eye only to the water, but to God rather, which did ordain the Baptism of water, and commanded it to be done in his name. For he is almighty, and able to work in us by Baptism forgiveness of our sins, and all those wonderful effects and operations for the which he hath ordained the same, although man's reason is not able to conceive the same. Therefore, consider, good children, the great treasures and benefits whereof God maketh us partakers when we are baptized, which be these. The first is, that in Baptism our sins be forgiven us, as Saint Peter witnesseth, saying, 'Let every one of you be baptized for the forgiveness of his sins.' The second is, that the Holy Ghost is given us, the which doth spread abroad the love of God in our hearts, whereby we may keep God's commandments according to this saying of Saint Peter, 'Let every one of you be baptized in the name of Christ, and then you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.'

"The third is, that by Baptism the whole righteousness of Christ is *given* unto us that we may claim the same as our own. For so Saint Paul teacheth, saying, 'As many of ye as are baptized in Christ have put upon you Christ."—*P.* 8.

"By this which I have hitherto spoken, I trust you understand, good children, wherefore Baptism is called the bath of regeneration, *and how in baptism we be born again, and be made new creatures in Christ.*" *p.* 9.

"But peradventure some will say, how can water work such great things? To whom I answer, that it is not the water that doeth these things, but the almighty word of God (which is knit

and joined to the water,) and faith which receiveth God's word and promise. For without the word of God, water is water, and not Baptism. But when the word of the living God is added and joined to the water, then it is the bath of regeneration, and Baptism water, and the lively spring of eternal salvation, and a bath that washeth our souls by the Holy Ghost, as Saint Paul calleth it, saying, 'God hath saved us through his mercy, by the bath of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured upon us plenteously by Jesus Christ our Saviour, that we *being made righteous* by his grace may be heirs of everlasting life.' This is a sure and true word."—*P.* 11, 12.

"And when you shall be asked, 'What availeth Baptism?' you shall answer, Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin, it delivereth from the kingdom of the devil and from death, and giveth life and everlasting salvation to all them that believe these words of Christ, and promise of God, which are written in the last chapter of Saint Mark, his Gospel, 'He that will believe and be baptized shall be saved, but he that will not believe shall be damned."—*Page* 30.

We all know that Bishop Ridley was recommended to the notice of Cranmer by certain high-church qualifications, which would in these days have had, with some parties, a very contrary effect; "his well-known acquaintance with the Scriptures and the Fathers."—*Soame's Reformation,* iii. 28. In his great and learned work against Transubstantiation, we find him arguing thus: "Now on the other side, if after the truth shall be truly tried out, it be found that the substance of bread is the material substance of the Sacrament, *although for the change of the use, office and dignity of the bread, the bread indeed, sacramentally, is* CHANGED *into the body of Christ, as the water in baptism is sacramentally changed into the fountain of regeneration,* and yet the material substance thereof

remaineth all one as before, &c."—*Enchiridion, vol.* i., *p.* 72. Indeed, all who are but slightly acquainted with the works of our Reformers, must be aware that this was their favourite argument against Transubstantiation: "There is no need to hold the dogma of Transubstantiation in order to believe that Christ is imparted in the Eucharist, because he is equally imparted in baptism, and yet no one contends that the water is transubstantiated." This great martyr declares, "As the body is nourished by the bread and wine at the Communion, and the soul by grace and spirit with the body of Christ; even so in baptism, the body is washed with the visible water, and *the soul cleansed from all filth by the invisible Holy Ghost*, and yet the water ceaseth not to be water, but keepeth the nature of water still. In like sort in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the bread ceaseth not to be bread."—*Wordsworth's Life of Ridley*, iii. *p.* 238. See also *Ridley's Life of Ridley, pp.* 684, 669, 620.

"Like as Christ was born in rags," says Bishop Latimer, "so the conversion of the whole world is by rags, by things which are most vile in this world. For what is so common as water? Every foul ditch is full of it: yet we wash out remission of our sins by Baptism, for like as he was found in rags, so we must find him by Baptism. There we begin; we are washed with water, and then the words are added; for we are Baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, whereby the Baptism receiveth its strength. Now this Sacrament of Baptism is a thing of great weight; for it ascertaineth and assureth us, that like as the water washeth the body and cleanseth it, so the blood of Christ our Saviour cleanseth and washeth it from all filth and uncleanness of sin." *Latimer's Sermons*, ii. 779.

"*As therefore in Baptism*," says Bradford, "*is given to us the Holy Ghost and pardon of our sins*, which yet lie not lurking in the water; so in the Lord's Supper is given unto us *the Communion of Christ's body and blood*, without transubstantiation, or including the same in the bread. By Baptism the old man is put off, the new man is put on, yea Christ is put on without transubstantiating the water. And even so it is in the Lord's Supper."

Bradford's Sermon on the Lord's Supper, quoted in Wordsworth's Life of Latimer, iii. 236.

Dr. Wordsworth gives a similar quotation from Cranmer's answer to Gardyner, one of his latest works: "I mean that he is PRESENT in the ministration and receiving of that Holy Supper according to his own institution and ordinance, like as in Baptism, Christ and the Holy Ghost be not *in* the water or font, but be *given in the ministration*, or to them that be duly baptized in the water."—*Cranmer's answer to Gardyner, p.* 172. In the Tracts of the Anglican Fathers, quotations to the same effect are given from Bishop Hooper, *page* 15.

And now having vindicated our pious Reformers from the insinuation of Mr. Scott, that they sought the propagation of doctrines which they did not believe, and having shewn what High Churchmen they are in this respect, I shall call before my reader, a witness whose testimony is valuable to the facts,—that baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England, that it is the doctrine of our Reformers, that the doctrine is scriptural, and that it is burdensome to some,—but *not* to those who believe with

the Church of England, that the Scriptures teach that regeneration is the inward grace of baptism.

"In the baptismal service, *we thank God for having regenerated the baptized infant by his Holy Spirit.* Now from hence it appears that *in the opinion of our Reformers, regeneration and remission of sins did accompany baptism.* But in what sense did they hold this sentiment? Did they maintain that there was no need for the seed then sown in the heart of the baptized person to grow up and to bring forth fruit; or that he could be saved in any other way than by a progressive renovation of his soul after the divine image? Had they asserted any such doctrine as that, it would have been impossible for any enlightened person to concur with them. But nothing can be conceived more repugnant to their sentiments than such an idea as this; so far from harbouring such a thought, they have, and that too in this very prayer, taught us to look to God for that total change both of heart and life which *long since their days has begun to be expressed* by the term regeneration. *After thanking God for regenerating the infant by his Holy Spirit,* we are taught to pray 'that he being dead unto sin and living unto righteousness may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin,' and then declaring the total change to be the necessary mean of his obtaining salvation, we add 'so that finally with the residue of thy holy Church he *may be* an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom.' Is there (I would ask) any person that can require more than this? or does God in his word require more? There are two things to be noticed in reference to this subject, the *term* regeneration and the *thing.* The term occurs but twice in the Scriptures; in one place it refers to Baptism, and is distinguished from the renewing of the Holy Ghost; *which however is represented as attendant on it:* and in the other place it has a totally distinct meaning unconnected with the subject. Now the *term* they use as the *Scripture* uses it, and the thing they require as strongly as any person can require it. They do not give us any reason to imagine than an adult person can be saved without experiencing all that *modern* divines [*Ultra-protestant divines*] have included in the term regeneration; on the contrary, they do both there and in the Liturgy insist upon a radical change of both heart and life. Here, then, the only question is

not 'Whether a baptized person can be saved by that ordinance without sanctification,' but whether God does always accompany the sign with the thing signified? Here is certainly room for difference of opinion; *but it cannot be positively decided in the negative;* because we cannot know or even judge respecting it in any case whatever except by the fruits that follow: and therefore in all fairness it may be considered only as a doubtful point; and if he appeal, as he ought to do, to the holy Scriptures, they certainly do, in *a very remarkable way, accord with the expressions in our Liturgy.* St. Paul says, 'By one Spirit we are ALL baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been ALL made to *drink into* one Spirit.' And this he says of all the visible members of Christ's Body, (1 *Cor.* xii. 13, 27.) Again, speaking of the whole nation of Israel, infants as well as adults, he says, 'They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did ALL eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and *that Rock was Christ.*' (1 *Cor.* x. 1, 4.) Yet, behold, in the very next verse he tells us that, 'with many of them God was displeased, and overthrew them in the wilderness.' In another place he speaks yet more strongly still: 'As many of you,' says he, 'as are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.' Here we see what is meant by the expression 'baptized into Christ': it is precisely the same expression as that before mentioned, of the Israelites being 'baptized unto Moses:' (the preposition εἰς is used in both places; it includes all that had been initiated into his religion by the rite of baptism; and of them UNIVERSALLY does the Apostle say, '*they have put on Christ.*' Now I ask, have not the persons, who scruple the use of that prayer in the baptismal service, equal reason to scruple the use of these different expressions?

"Again—St. Paul says, 'Repent and be Baptized every one of you *for the remission of sins.*'—(*Acts*, ii. 38, 39.) And in another place, 'Baptism doth now save us.'—(1 *Pet.* iii. 21.) And speaking elsewhere of Baptized persons who were unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, he says, '*He hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.*'—(2 *Pet.* i. 9.) *Does not this very strongly countenance the* IDEA WHICH OUR REFORMERS ENTERTAINED, THAT THE REMISSION OF OUR SINS, AND

THE REGENERATION OF OUR SOULS, IS ATTENDANT ON THE BAPTISMAL RITE? Perhaps it will be said that the inspired writers spake of persons who had been Baptized at an adult age. But if they did so in some places, they certainly did not in others; and where they did not, they must be understood as comprehending all, whether infants or adults: and therefore the language of our Liturgy, which is not a whit stronger than theirs, may be both subscribed and used without any just occasion of offence.

"Let me, then, speak the truth before God: though I am no Arminian, *I do think the refinements of Calvin have done great harm in the Church;* they have driven *multitudes from the plain and popular way of speaking used by the inspired writers* and have made them unreasonably and unscripturally squeamish in their modes of expression; and I conceive that the less addicted any person is to systematic accuracy, the more he will accord with the inspired writers, and the more he will approve the views of our Reformers. I do not mean, however, to say that a slight alteration in two or three instances would not be an improvement, since it would take off a *burthen* from many minds, and supersede the necessity of laboured explanations: but I do mean to say that there is no such objection to these expressions as to deter any conscientious person from giving his unfeigned assent and consent to the Liturgy altogether, or from using the particular expressions which we have been endeavouring to explain."

Simeon's Works, vol. ii. *p.* 259.

Whether Mr. Simeon may have written differently in other parts of his voluminous works, I am not sufficiently acquainted with those works to be able to say, but I venture to quote this as one of the most lucid expositions and one of the most scriptural vindications of the doctrine of regeneration as held by our English Reformers, and for holding which so much abuse is heaped upon those who are designated High Churchmen, that has fallen under my notice. Mr. Simeon shews that our services do unequivocally assert that regeneration

takes place at Baptism, that they are scriptural in doing so, and that those absurd consequences which some persons would suppose to be connected with the doctrine do not of necessity follow. He tells us that some persons find this, the unquestionable doctrine of the Church, such a "burthen" that they require some "slight alteration in one or two places"; and that in default of these alterations they are obliged to have recourse to "*laboured* explanations." Against these persons I wish to say nothing,—if they can conscientiously remain in the Church I rejoice to consider them as brethren. But they generally assume an exclusive respect for Scripture; yet, according to Mr. Simeon's shewing, the expressions of Scripture, for he proves the expressions of our Baptismal Service and those of Scripture to be identical, are a burthen to them. In this instance, then, we, who want no alteration, are more scriptural than they are. If they can conscientiously adopt their "laboured explanations," they are perfectly welcome. But what those persons have a right to complain of, who receive the expressions of the Liturgy in their plain and simple sense, who labour after no "explanations," complain of no "burthen," would resolutely resist any "alteration," is this, that an attempt is made to make it appear that *they* are the persons innovating in the Church; that *they* are opposed to the Reformers; that *they* are unscriptural. Mr. Simeon perceived how the quarrel commenced. By those attached

to the *foreign* school of Reformation, regeneration is used in a sense different from that which prevails among those who are attached to the principles of the *English* Reformation. He would propose that we should yield to the advocates of the foreign Reformation or Ultra-protestants. To such a proposition we shall never assent, for our phraseology is that of the Church Universal, the other that merely of a sect or party comparatively small. The distinction between regeneration and renovation is clearly preserved by those divines who are attached to the English Reformation, as may be seen from the following quotations from Bishop Bethell's work on Regeneration,—a work which has long been regarded as a standard on this subject. Following and referring to Waterland, he remarks:—

"Regeneration is the joint work of water and the Spirit, or, to speak more properly, of the Spirit only; renovation is the joint work of the Spirit and the man. Regeneration comes only once in or through Baptism. Renovation exists before, in, and after Baptism, and may be often repeated. Regeneration, being a single act, can have no parts, and is incapable of increase. Renovation is in its very nature progressive. Regeneration, though suspended as to its effects and benefits, cannot be totally lost in the present life. Renovation may be often repeated and totally lost."

Afterwards he illustrates this doctrine by applying it to four separate cases.

"1. Grown persons coming to Baptism properly qualified, receive at once the grace of Regeneration; but however well prepared, they are not regenerate without Baptism. Afterwards renovation grows more and more within them by the indwelling of the Spirit.

"2. As to infants, their innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not want, and of actual faith, which they cannot have: and they are capable of being born again, and adopted by God, because they bring no obstacle. They stipulate, and the Holy Spirit translates them out of a state of nature into a state of grace, favour, and acceptance. In their case, regeneration precedes, and renovation follows after, and they are the temple of the Spirit, till they defile themselves with sin.

"3. As to those who fall off after regeneration, their covenant state abides, but without any saving effect, because without present renovation: but this saving effect may be repaired and recovered by repentance.

"4. With respect to those who receive Baptism in a state of hypocrisy or impenitency, though this Sacrament can only increase their condemnation, still pardon and grace are conditionally made over to them, and the saving virtue of regeneration, which had been hitherto suspended, takes effect when they truly repent and unfeignedly believe the gospel.

"This clear statement of the learned author contains an accurate representation of the grace conferred, and the change which takes place in Baptism; and this is what is meant by those Divines who maintain that regeneration is in the strict sense of the word, the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism. The identity, if I may so express myself, of Baptism and Regeneration, is a doctrine which manifestly pervades the writings of the Fathers. It is moreover evident that they did not imagine that Baptism produces any saving effect in adults without faith and repentance, or, in other words, without some previous renewal of the inward frame. Nor do they appear to have supposed any positive or active renewal of the soul takes place in infants. Hence it follows that they must have maintained this distinction between regeneration and renovation, or conversion, which, in the present day, has been styled, by a strange fatality, a novel contrivance. Sufficient proofs, however, of a positive kind may be collected from their own writings, that they maintained this distinction."

Bp. Bethell on Regeneration,
pp. 14, 16.

2. EUCHARIST.—In producing the opinions of our Reformers on the Sacrament of Baptism, I have incidentally brought forward their opinions on the Eucharist, and shewn that as private controversialists they held in both instances the doctrines which as Reformers they propagated. The Commons, in 1549, broke out into a dangerous rebellion, and to their articles of complaint Cranmer wrote the answer. To the seventh article he makes reply, (shewing that his notion of superstition and idolatry was somewhat different from that which now prevails in certain quarters,)

"O superstition and idolatry! how they prevail among you! *The very true heavenly bread, the food of everlasting life, offered to you in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion,* you refuse to eat, but only at Easter; and *the cup of the most holy blood,* wherewith you were redeemed and washed from your sins, you refuse utterly to drink of at any time. And yet instead of these you will eat often of the unsavoury and poisoned bread of the Bishop of Rome, and drink of his *stinking* puddles, which he nameth holy bread and holy water."

Cranmer's Works, ii. 226.

The language of Cranmer, it is admitted, is not always so strong as that of Ridley, but still it would be considered by many in these days as savoring of Popery, in their undefined use of that expression. In 1548 he published his translation of Justus Jonas's Catechism, with some alterations and corrections by himself. To the statements therein made he professed to the very last to adhere, and repudiated the idea of his having deviated from the doctrine therein propounded (see his Works, ii. 440, iii. 13, 297, 344). From

this Catechism, therefore, I select the following passages. The title itself would offend some modern ears,

"The Blessed Sacrament of the Altar."

"Christ saith of the bread, 'This is my body'; and of the cup he saith, 'This is my blood.' Wherefore we ought to believe that in the Sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ. For God is Almighty (as ye heard in the creed.) He is able, therefore, to do all things what he will. And as Saint Paul writeth, he calleth those things which be not as if they were. Wherefore, when Christ taketh bread and saith, 'Take, eat, this is my body,' we ought not to doubt but we eat his very body. And when he taketh the cup and saith, 'Take, drink, this is my blood,' we ought to think assuredly that we drink his very blood.* And this we must believe, if we will be counted Christian men.

"And whereas in this perilous time certain deceitful persons be found in many places, who of very frowardness will not grant that there is the body and blood of Christ, but deny the same, for none other cause but that they cannot compass, by man's blind reason, how this thing should be brought to pass; ye, good children, shall with all diligence beware of such persons, that ye suffer not yourselves to be deceived by them. For such men surely are not true Christians, neither as yet have they learned the first article of the creed, which teacheth that God is Almighty, which ye, good children, have already perfectly learned. Wherefore eschew such erroneous opinions, and believe the words of our Lord Jesus, that you eat and drink his very body and blood, although man's reason cannot comprehend *how and after what manner* the same is there present. For the wisdom of reason must be subdued to the obedience of Christ, as the Apostle Paul teacheth."

Tracts of Anglican Fathers, p. 38.

Again.

"Christ saith, do this in remembrance of me. Here also it is our duty to obey the word of Christ, and to do the thing which he hath commanded us to do. Wherefore, good children,

* "The body and blood of Christ which are VERILY AND INDEED taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."—*Church Catechism.*

doubt not, but there is the body and blood of our Lord, which we receive in the Lord's Supper. For he hath said so, and by the power of his word hath caused it so to be. Wherefore, seeing Christ saith, "Do this as often as ye do it in remembrance of me;" it is evident hereby that Christ causeth, even at this time, his body and blood to be in the Sacrament after that manner and fashion as it was at that time when he made his Maundy* with his disciples. For else we could not do that thing which his disciples did. But Christ hath commanded us to do the selfsame thing that his disciples did, and to do it in the remembrance of him, that is to say, to receive his body and blood, even so as he himself did give it to his disciples. And let not the foolish talk of unbelievers move you, who are wont to ask this question, how can the priest or minister make the body and blood of Christ? To the which I answer, that the minister doth not this thing of himself [alone]; but Christ himself doth give unto us his flesh and blood, as his words doth evidently declare. Neither let their arguments or reasons persuade you which say that the Sacrament ought not to be received under both kinds, but under one kind only. For Christ gave to his disciples both kinds, and hath bid us that we also should do the same. And when he gave the cup to his disciples, he added thereto this commandment, in these express and plain words, saying, 'Drink ye all of this.' Now we ought to obey God more then men; we ought, therefore, to receive the Sacrament under both kinds, as Christ commanded us; and regard not the gaggling of them that speak against the use of the Sacrament under both kinds, saying, it maketh no great matter, whether ye receive it under both kinds, or one alone, and that it pertaineth not the salvation to receive it under both kinds. But what shall I dispute long in this matter? Take this for a conclusion, that it is only laudable and good to do that thing, which Christ hath commanded, and not to swerve from the same.—*p.* 40.

"Furthermore, if any man ask ye, what availeth it, thus to eat and drink? ye shall answer, these words do declare what profit we receive thereby, 'My body which is given for you'—'My blood which is shed for you, for the forgiveness of sins.' By the which words Christ declareth, that by this Sacrament and words

* The Thursday before Good Friday.

of promise are given to us remission of sins, life, and salvation; for where forgiveness of sin is, there is also life and salvation. Again, if a man will go further with you, and ask you, how can bodily eating and drinking have so great strength and operation? Ye shall answer, to eat and to drink doth not work so great things, but this word and promise of God, 'My body which was given for you,"—'My blood which was shed for you, for the remission of sins.' This word of God is added to the outward signs, as the chief thing in the Sacrament. He that believeth these words, he hath that thing which the words promise, that is to say, forgiveness of his sins.

"Besides this, if a man ask of you, who be they who do worthily receive this Sacrament? ye shall answer, that fasting, abstinence, and such other like, are profitable for an outward discipline and chastisement of the body: but he receiveth the Sacrament worthily that hath faith to believe these words, 'My body which was given for you:"—'My blood which was shed for you, for the remission of sins.' But he that believeth not these words, or doubteth of them, he receiveth the Lord's Supper unworthily. For this word, 'given for you,' doth require a faithful and believing heart." *pp.* 43, 44.

To Bishop Ridley Archbishop Cranmer was indebted for the alteration which took place in his opinions with respect to the doctrine of transubstantiation; the learned Ridley having discovered from the writings of Bertram that it was no primitive doctrine. The opinions of Ridley are therefore worthy of consideration. Of Ridley his biographer states—

"He always believed and maintained a *real* presence by grace to faith, and not a mere figure only: and although there were some English fanatics such as John Webb, George Roper, and Gregory Paske, who believed that the Sacrament was only a bare sign of Christ's body, and nothing more than a remembrance of it: yet this was *not* the opinion of our martyrs."

Wordsworth's Biography.
From Foxe and Ridley, iii. 147.

What was the opinion of our blessed martyr Ridley may be stated in his own words:

"This remembraunce thus ordeined, as the author thereof is Christ both God and man; so by the almighty power of God, farre passeth all kind of remembraunces that any other man is able to make, either of himself or of any other thing, for whosoever receiveth this holye Sacrament thus ordeyned in remembraunce of Christ, he receyveth therewith either death or lyfe. In this I doo trust we all agree. For Sainete Paule saith of the godlie receyers in the tenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians: The cuppe of blessing which we blesse, *is it not the partaking or fellowship of Christes bloud?* And also he saieth: the bread which we breake (and meaneth at the Lord's table), *is it not the partaking or fellowshippe of Christes bodie.* Now the partaking of Christes bodie and of his bloude unto the faithfull and godlie, is the partaking or fellowship of life and of immortalitie.

Enchiridion, p. 69.

"The controversie no doubte whiche at thys daye troubleth the churche, (wherein anye meane learned man eitheir olde or newe doth stand in,) is not whether the holie Sacrament of the bodye and bloud of Christ is no better than a piece of common breade or not? Or whether the Lorde's table is no more to bee regarded than the table of any earthlye man or noe? Or whether it is but a bare signe or figure of Christ and nothing elles or noe? For all do graunt that St. Paules words do require, that the breade which we breake, is the partaking of the bodie of Christ. And all also doe graunt him that eateth of that breade or drinketh of that cuppe unworthilie, to be giltie of the Lordes death, and to eate and drinke his owne damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lordes bodie. All doe graunt that these wordes of St. Paule when he saith (if we eat it avantageth us nothing, or if we eate not, we want nothing therby) are not spoken of the Lordes table, but of other common meates." *Enchiridion*, p. 71.

Most clearly and unequivocally does he declare the truth as it is still held in the Church of England, at his last trial:

"My Lord, you know that where any *equivocation* (which is a word having two significations) is, except distinction be

given, no direct answere can be made; for it is one of Aristotles fallacies, containing two questions under one, the which cannot be satisfied with one answere. For both you and I agree herein, that in the Sacrament is the very true and naturall bodie and bloud of Christ, even that which was borne of the Virgine Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quicke and the deade, only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being; we confesse all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there, I, being fully by God's word thereto perswaded, confesse Christ's naturall bodie to be in the Sacrament in deede by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthilie that bread and wine, receiveth effectuously Christ's body and drinketh his blood, that is, he is made effectually partaker of his passion: and you make a grosser kinde of being, enclosing a naturall, a lively, and a mooving bodie under the shape or forme of bread and wine.

"Now, this difference considered, to the question thus I answere; that in the Sacrament of the Aultar is the naturall bodie and bloud of Christ *veré et realiter*, in deed and reality, if you take these tearmes in deede and really for spiritually by grace and efficacie; for so everie worthie receiver receiveth the verie true bodie of Christ: but if you meane really and indeed, so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable bodie under the formes of bread and wine, then in that sense is not Christ's body in the Sacrament really and indeed."

Wordsworth's Biography, iii. 237.

Such, too, are the opinions held by those divines who have always upheld the doctrines of the *English* Reformation, under the conviction that they are, happily, those of the Catholic Church.

"I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate in silence what we have by the Sacrament [of the Holy Eucharist] and less to dispute of *the manner how*. * * * * 'This is my body,' and 'this is my blood,' being words of promise, which we all agree that by the Sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves

with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation, or else by transubstantiation, the Sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ or no? A thing which no way can either further or hinder us howsoever it stand, because our participation of Christ in this Sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of his omnipotent power, which maketh it his body and blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the element such as they imagine we need not greatly to care or nquire."

Hooker's Eccl. Pol. book v. *ch.* lxvii. 3 *and* 6.

"As to the *manner* of the presence of the body of our Lord in the blessed Sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed according to the ancient Catholic Church, do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries; but, after the example of the primitive and purest Church of Christ, we leave it to the power and wisdom of our Lord, yielding a full and unfeigned assent to his words. Had the Romish maintainers of transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then imposed as an article of faith absolutely necessary to salvation, a manner of presence, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse, and there would have been in the Church less wrangling, and more peace and unity than now is."

Bishop Cosin's History of Transubstantiation,
In Tracts for the Times.

I may also here make a citation from Nowell's Catechism to shew how the subject was understood by him, who, when the Reformation was completed, took what was then regarded as a very moderate, if not a low view of the subject.

"*Master.*—It is very true that thou sayest, Now tell me the order of the Lord's Supper.

"*Scholar.*—It is even the same which the Lord Christ did institute, who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread &c. This is the form and order of the Lord's Supper, which we ought to hold, and holily to keep, till he come.

"*Mast.*—For what use?

"*Scho.*—To celebrate and retain continually a thankful remembrance of the Lord's death, and of that most singular

benefit which we have received thereby; and that as in baptism we were once born again, so with the Lord's Supper we be always fed and sustained to spiritual and everlasting life.

"*Mast.*—Thou sayest, then, that it is enough to be once baptized, as to be once born: but thou affirmest that the Lord's Supper, like as food must be often used.

"*Scho.*—Yea, forsooth, master.

"*Mast.*—Dost thou say that there are two parts in this Sacrament also, as in Baptism?

"*Scho.*—Yea, the one part the bread and wine, the outward signs, which are seen with our eyes, handled with our hands, and felt with our taste; the other part Christ himself, with whom our souls, as with their proper food, are inwardly nourished.

"*Mast.*—And dost thou say that all ought alike to receive both parts of the Sacrament?

"*Scho*—Yea, verily, master, for sith the Lord hath expressly so commanded, it were a most high offence in any part to abridge his commandment.

"*Mast.*—Why would the Lord have here two signs to be used?

"*Scho.*—First, he severally gave the signs both of his body and blood, that it might be the more plain express image of his death which he suffered, his body being torn, his side pierced, and all his blood shed, and that the memory thereof so printed in our hearts should strike the deeper. And moreover, that the Lord might so provide for and help our weakness, and thereby manifestly declare, that as the bread for nousishment of our bodies, so his body hath most singular force and efficacy, spiritually to feed our souls: and as with wine men's hearts are cheered, and their strength confirmed, so with his blood our souls are relieved and refreshed; that certainly assuring ourselves that he is not only our meat, but also our drink, we do not any where else but in him alone seek any part of our spiritual nourishment and eternal life.

"*Mast.*—Is there, then, not an only figure, but the truth itself, of the benefits that thou hast rehearsed, delivered in the Supper?

"*Scho.*—What else? For sith Christ is the truth itself, it is no doubt but that the thing which he testifieth in words, and representeth in signs, he performeth also in deed, and delivereth

it unto us; and that he as surely maketh them that believe in him partakers of his body and blood, as they surely know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach."

Nowell's Catechism.

I may add, in conclusion, that in one of our highest and holiest offices, the Communion Service of our Church, as administered to the Sovereign at his consecration, prayer is made that God would bless the bread and wine, through which the oblation is made, that *by* them, when thus blessed, we may be made partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ. The rubric and prayer is as follows:—

"THE QUEEN OFFERS BREAD AND WINE.

"And first the Queen offers *Bread* and *Wine* for the Communion, which being brought out of King *Edward's* Chapel, and delivered into his hands, the *Bread* upon the *Paten* by the *Bishop* that read the *Epistle*, and the *Wine* in the *Chalice* by the *Bishop* that read the *Gospel*, are by the Archbishop received from the Queen, and reverently placed upon *the altar*, and decently covered with a fair linen Cloth, the Archbishop first saying this prayer:

"Bless, O Lord, we beseech thee, these thy Gifts, and sanctify them unto this holy use, that *by them* we may be made partakers of the Body and Blood of thine only begotten Son Jesus Christ, and fed unto everlasting life of Soul and Body: And that thy Servant Queen VICTORIA may be enabled to the discharge of her weighty Office, whereunto of thy great goodness thou hast called and appointed her. Grant this, O Lord, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. *Amen.*

That this may be wrong and Popish in the opinion of some persons, is true,—but then we have to bare the charge in common with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and all the Bishops who took part in the service.

Note M, p. 31.

The words of Cranmer are:—

"The holy Apostle Saint Paul, good children, in the tenth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, writeth on this fashion, 'Whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord shall be saved. But how shall they call on him on whom they believe not? How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? How shall they hear without a preacher? How shall they preach except they be sent?' By the which words Saint Paul doth evidently declare unto us two lessons.

"The first is, that it is necessary to our salvation to have preachers and ministers of God's most holy Word, to instruct us in the true faith and knowledge of God.

"The second is, that preachers must not run to this high honour before they be called thereto, but they must be ordained and appointed to this office, and sent to us by God. For it is not possible to be saved, or to please God, without faith; and no man can truly believe in God by his own wit (for of ourselves we know not what we should believe), but we must needs hear God's Word taught us by others.

"Again, the teachers, except they be called and sent, cannot fruitfully teach. For the seed of God's Word doth never bring forth fruit, unless the Lord of the harvest do give increase, and by his Holy Spirit do work with the sower. But God doth not work with the preacher whom he hath not sent, as Saint Paul saith.

"'How shall they preach if they be not sent?' Wherefore it is requisite that preachers should be called and sent of God; and they must preach according to the authority and commission of God, granted unto them, whereby they may strengthen men's belief, and assure their consciences that God hath commanded them to preach after this or that fashion. For else every man should still be in doubt and think after this sort; who knoweth whether this be true which I hear the preacher say? Who can tell whether God hath commanded him to preach these things or no? And in case he teacheth nothing but truth, yet I am not sure that God will work with me, as the preacher promiseth? Perchance these promises pertain to other, and not to me? These

doubts, in the time of temptation, might trouble men's minds, if we were not assured that our Lord Jesus Christ himself, hath both ordained and appointed ministers and preachers to teach his holy word, and to minister his Sacraments; and also hath appointed them what they shall teach in his name, and what they shall do unto us. Therefore he called them and sent them, and gave them instructions what they should do, and speak to us in his name, to the intent that we should give sure credence unto their words, and believe that God will work with us according to his words by them spoken. And he hath promised, therefore, that whatsoever they should bind upon earth should be bound in heaven; and whatsoever they should loose upon earth, should be loosed in heaven. Wherefore, good children, to the intent you may steadfastly believe all things which God by his Ministers doth teach, and promise unto you, and so be saved by your faith; learn diligently, I pray you, by what words our Lord Jesus Christ gave this commission and commandment to his Ministers, and rehearse them here, word for word, that so you may print them in your memories, and recite them the better when you come home. The words of Christ be these:—

"'OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST BREATHED ON HIS APOSTLES, AND SAID, RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST: WHOSE SINS YE FORGIVE, THEY ARD FORGIVEN UNTO THEM; AND WHOSE SINS YOU RESERVE, THEY ARE RESERVED.'

"Now, good children, you shall employ yourselves not only to rehearse these words without book, but also to understand what our Lord Jesus Christ meant by them; that when you shall be asked any question herein, you may make a direct answer, and that also in time to come you may be able to instruct your children in the same. For what greater shame can there be, either in the sight of God or of man, than to profess thyself to be a Christian man, and yet to be ignorant in what place of Scripture, and by what words, Christ commanded faith and forgiveness of sins to be preached? seeing that a Christian man ought to believe nothing as an article of his faith, except he be assured, that either it is God's commandment, or his word.

"Now, good children, that you may the better understand these words of our Saviour Christ, you shall know that our Lord

Jesus Christ, when he began to preach, he did call and choose his twelve Apostles; and afterwards, besides those twelve, he sent forth three score and ten disciples, and gave them authority to preach the gospel. And a little before his death and passion he made his prayer to his heavenly father for them, and for all those that should believe through their preaching as it is declared in the Gospel of Saint John. Now it is not to be doubted but that Christ's prayer was heard of his heavenly father; wherefore it followeth, that as many as believed the preaching of Christ's disciples, were as surely saved as if they had heard and believed Christ himself. And after Christ's ascension the Apostles gave authority to other godly and holy men to minister God's word, and chiefly in those places where there were Christian men already, which lacked preachers, and the Apostles themselves could no longer abide with them: for the Apostles did walk abroad into divers parts of the world, and did study to plant the gospel in many places. Wherefore where they found godly men, and meet to preach God's word, they laid their hands upon them, and gave them the Holy Ghost, as they themselves received of Christ the same Holy Ghost, to execute this office.

"And they, that were so ordained, were indeed, and also were called the Ministers of God, as the Apostles themselves were, as Paul saith unto Timothy. And so the ministration of God's word (which our Lord Jesus Christ himself did first institute) was derived from the Apostles unto others after them, by imposition of hands and giving the Holy Ghost, from the Apostles' time to our days. And this was the consecration, orders, and unction of the Apostles whereby they, at the beginning, made Bishops and Priests, and this shall continue in the Church, even to the world's end. And whatsoever rite or ceremony hath been added more than this, cometh of man's ordinance and policy, and is not commanded by God's word.

"And on the other side, you shall take good heed and beware of false and privy preachers, which privily creep into cities, and preach in corners, having none authority, nor being called to this office. For Christ is not present with such preachers, and therefore doth not the Holy Ghost work by their preaching: but their word is without fruit or profit, and they do great hurt in Commonwealths. For such as be not called of God, they, no doubt of it, do err, and sow abroad heresy and naughty doctrine.

And yet, you shall not think, good children, that preachers which be lawfully called, have authority to do or teach whatsoever shall please them. But our Lord Jesus Christ hath given them plain instructions, what they ought to teach and do. And if they preach or do any other thing than is contained in their commission, then it is of no force, nor we ought not to regard it [nor ought we to regard it.] And for this cause our Saviour Christ did breathe into his disciples, and gave them the Holy Ghost. For where the Holy Ghost is, there he so worketh that he causeth us to do those things which Christ hath commanded. And when that is not done, then the Holy Ghost is not there. Wherefore all things which we shall so speak or do, can take none effect."

Cranmer's Sermon on the Apostolical Succession and Power of the Keys. Anglican Fathers, pp. 19, 23.

One of the falsehoods propagated in these days is, that the Reformers did not hold the divine right of episcopacy, but that this doctrine was subsequently introduced. That our Reformers were very generally of opinion, that where episcopacy could not be had, ordination by Presbyters might, as a *temporary* measure, be tolerated—just as grace will be given to those who desire to receive the Sacraments, but from circumstances are unable to do so,—is not to be denied; and I am not aware that any Churchman of the present day would disagree with them in the opinion, although, among the Protestants abroad, there is not now the same excuse for their want of episcopacy, as there was in the time of the Reformation. But the *episcopal succession was assumed as a necessary doctrine of the reformed Church of England, on the very first public occasion when our Reformers appeared in defence of the Reformation*, after the

accession of Elizabeth. At the authorised conference between the friends of the Reformation and the advocates of Romanism, to which allusion has before been made, Dean Horn, in the name of the Reformers observes, "*The Apostles' authority is derived upon after ages, and conveyed to the Bishops, their successors.*" Hence he contends for their apostolical authority to reform their Churches, without reference to the See of Rome, the Bishop of that See being only the equal of other Bishops. *Collier* ii. 418. The Puritans did not at first declare themselves hostile to episcopacy, but as soon as they did so, the English Reformers asserted the authority of Bishops as of divine right. Bishop Hutton maintained the doctrine, before Lord Burghley and Sir Francis Walsingham, with precisely the same arguments as those which are now employed. *See Strype's Life of Archbishop Whitgift.* iii. 224. Dr. Bancroft, too, defended the doctrine that Bishops were, *jure divino*, superior to the other Clergy, even though the Puritans attempted to silence him by craftily bringing in political considerations, and by contending that it was inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy. *Strype's Whitgift.* i. 559. In short, the divine right of episcopacy was asserted before it was questioned, for men did not question at first what for 1500 years had been undisputed; and as soon as ever it was questioned, it was immediately defended on scriptural grounds by a Bishop, and by the Archbishop's Chaplain.

Note N, p. 36.

The use of metrical Psalms was a concession made to the feelings of the ultra-Protestants at an early period. They form no part of our appointed services according to the rubric, but by one of Queen Elizabeth's injunctions, permission was given to those of the parishioners who chose to assemble before service commenced, or to stay after it was concluded, to sing Psalms. It is curious that we can name the precise period when the singing of a Psalm between the end of the Litany and the commencement of the Communion Service was introduced as *an innovation* into the Parish Church of Leeds. Under the date 1708, Thoresby in his Diary says,

"October 3—Was much interrupted in family course, partly by guests and partly by a most severe cold which has so absolutely taken away my voice that I was perfectly disabled from some duties, as particularly singing, *a new order of which was begun* this day in the Parish Church, *to sing a stave betwixt the daily Morning and Communion Service* (as has been long done in London, &c.) and is more agreeable, making a greater distinction, as there ought to be, betwixt the several parts."—ii. *p.* 10.

The innovation was noted and complained of at an early period.

"At the Reforming of this Church," says Heylin, "not onely the Queen's Chappel, and all Cathedrals, but many Parochial Churches, also had preserved their Organs; to which they used to sing the appointed Hymns; that is to say, the *Te Deum*, the *Benedictus*, the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc Dimittis*, &c., performed in an Artificial and Melodious manner, with the addition of Cornets, Sackbuts, and the like, on the Solemn Festivals, for which as they had ground enough from the holy Scripture, if the

practice and authority of David be of any credit; so were they warranted thereunto by the godly usage of the primitive times, after the Church was once restored to her peace and freedom. Certain I am, that St. Augustine imputes no small part of his conversion to that heavenly melodie which he heard very frequently in the Church of *Millaine*, professing that it did not only draw tears from him, though against his will, but raised his soul unto a sacred meditation on spiritual matters. But *Beza* having turn'd so many of the *Psalms* into metre, as had been left undone by *Marot*, gave an example unto *Sternhold* and *Hopkins* to attempt the like. Whose version being left unfinished, but brought unto an end by some of our English exiles which remained at *Geneva;* there was a purpose of imposing them upon the Church by little and little, that they might come as close as might be in all points to their mother city. At first, they sung them onely in their private houses, and afterwards (as beforesaid) adventured to sing them also in the Church, as in the way of entertainment, to take up the time till the beginning of the service, and afterwards to sing them as a part of the service itself. For so I understand that passage in the *Church Historian* in which he tells us that *Dr. Gervis* being then warden of *Merton* Colledge, had abolished certain Latine superstitious hymns which had been used on some of the festivals, appointing the *Psalms* in English to be sung in their place; and that as one *Leech* was ready to begin the *Psalm*, another of the fellows called *Hall*, snatched the book out of his hands and told him, *that they could no more dance after his pipe.* But whatsoever *Hall* thought of them, *Beza* and his disciples were perswaded otherwise. And that he might the better cry down that melodious harmony which was retained in the Church of *England*, and so make way for the *Genevian* fashion, even in that point also; he tells us in the same letter to *Bishop Grindal, That the artificial musick then retained in the Church of England,* was fitter to be used in masks and dancings,* than *religious offices, and rather served to please the ear then move the affections.* Which censure being passed upon it by so great a *Rabby*, most wonderful it was how sundenly some men of good note and quality, who otherwise deserved well enough of the Church of

* Alluding to chanting and to our Cathedral Service.

England, did bend their wits and pens against it; and with what earnestness they laboured to have their own tunes publickly introduced into all the churches, which that they might the better do, they procured the *Psalms* in English metre, to be bound in the same volume with the Publick Liturgie, and sometimes with the Bible also, setting them forth, as being *allowed*, (so the title tells us) *to be sung in all Churches before and after Morning and Evening Prayer, as also before and after Sermons;* but with what truth and honesty, we have heard before."

Heylin's Hist. of Presbyterians, p. 254, 255.

I am not contending for the discontinuance of the metrical Psalms, for I delight in congregational singing, though I regret that, in our parochial Churches, they have superseded the antiphonal chanting of the Psalms of the Day. We might speak more strongly of the very novel introduction of unauthorized Hymns, which, as the present Bishop of Peterborough remarks, "if they do not *directly* impugn our Liturgy and Articles, may inculcate sentiments which are at variance with every fair conclusion which may be drawn from our Liturgy and Articles," may certainly be deprecated. But I intend not now to condemn the practice, but merely to notice the fact. I feel that I have no right to *condemn*, but I may notice an innovation, if it be only to shew *who* are the innovators, and to request them, while living in a glass house, not to pelt so pitilessly, as is frequently done, those of their brethren, who, in regulating the services of the sanctuary, are desirous of attending as strictly as possible to the Rubric, although they may reverence the Rubric not the less for its retention of so much of primitive usages

NOTE O, p. 36.

TURNING FROM THE PEOPLE IN PRAYER.

Among the things complained of by the Puritans in the Convocation of 1562, this was one. They petitioned "that in all parish churches the minister in Common Prayer *might turn his face towards the people*."—*Strype's Annals*, i. *pt.* 1, *p.* 502. A petition to the same effect had been previously made, and both petitions were refused. What makes this the more remarkable, is that, as will be seen in the next note, the change *had* been made at the end of Edward the Sixth's reign; and, in order to please certain *foreigners*, orders had been given to turn *towards* the people in prayer. The order was reversed in Elizabeth's reign, and we see from the above quotation that the practice of turning *from* the people, *i. e.* towards the East, was instituted by the Reformers who completed our Reformation. Of those who petitioned that the minister might be compelled to turn *to* the people, Strype remarks: "By the foregoing Articles we may plainly perceive how much biassed these divines (*i. e.* those who petitioned that the minister might turn his face towards the people,) were (most of which seem to have been exiles,) towards those platforms which were received *in the reformed churches where they had a little before sojourned*," thus again shewing the foreign prejudices of ultra-protestants. Other passages to the same effect might be produced if it were worth while. The

following extract is made, because it relates to several points alluded to in this part of the discourse. In his preface to the Cyprianus Anglicus, Heylin thus describes the customs of the Church of England before the Rebellion :—

"In the officiating of which acts of God's divine service, the *Priest* or *Presbyter* is enjoined to wear a *surplice* of white linen cloath, to testifie the purity of doctrine, and innocency of life and conversation, which ought to be in one of that holy profession. And this *St. Jerome* tells us in the general, *Religionem Divinum alterum habitum habere in ministerio, alterum in usu vitaque communi :* that is to say, that in the Act of Ministration, they used a different habit from what they use to wear at ordinary times. And what this different habit was, he tells us more particularly in his reply against *Pelagius*, who, it seems, disliked it, and asked him what offence he thought it could be to God, that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, or those of any inferiour order, *in Administratione Sacrificiorum candidi veste processerint*, did in the ministration of the Sacrament bestir themselves in a white vesture; so he *advers. Pelag. Lib.* 2, with which compare *St. Chrysostom* in his 83d *Homily* on *St. Matthews* gospel, for the *Eastern* churches; *and hereunto* the Cope *was added in some principal Churches, especially in the celebration of the blessed* Eucharist. Both which appear most evidently by the first *Liturgy of King Edward* VI. compared with one of the last clauses of the Act of Parliament, 1 Eliz. c. 2, in which it is provided, *that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers shall be retained and be in use, as were in the Church of* England *by* authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. But this vesture having been discontinued, (I know not by what fatal negligence,) many years together, it pleased the Bishops and *Clergy* in the *Convocation*, *Anno.* 1603, to pass a *Canon* to this purpose, viz., "That in *Cathedral* and *Collegiate* Churches, the Holy Communion shall be administred upon principal Feast dayes, sometimes by the Bishops, &c. and that the principal Minister using a decent *Cope*, &c."—*Canon* 24.

"In that part of divine service which concerns the offering of the people's prayers to Almighty God, it was required of the

Priest or *Presbyter*, first, that in all the dayes and times appointed, he used the prayers prescribed in the Public *Liturgy*, according to the Act of Parliament 1 Eliz. c. 2. And many subsequent *Canons* and *Constitutions*, made in that behalf. Secondly, "That he conformed himself to those *rites* and *ceremonies*, which were prescribed in that book, and unto such as should be afterwards ordained by the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners, appointed and authorised under the great Seal of *England*, for Causes Ecclesiastical, or of the *Metropolitan* of this Realm, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of his Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments. And thirdly, and more particularly, "That in his reading of the Prayers and Psalms he turn his face toward the east, and toward the people in the reading of the lessons or chapters," as appears plainly by the Rubrick which directs him thus, "That after the reading of the Psalms, the Priest shall read two lessons distinctly, that the people may hear; the Priest that reads the two lessons standing, and turning himself so as he may be best heard of all such as be present." The Psalms or Hymns to be indifferently said or sung at the will of the Minister; but the *Hymns* for the most part sung with *organs*, and sometimes with other musical instruments; both in the *Royal* Chapels and *Cathedral* Churches. Fourthly, "That he makes use of no other Prayers in the Congregation (and therefore neither before nor after Sermon) than those which are prescribed in the said Book of Common Prayer; it being specially provided in the act aforesaid, that no Priest nor Minister shall use any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper openly, or privately, or *Mattins*, Evening Song, Administration of the Sacraments, or other *open Prayers*, (that is to say, such Prayers as are meant for others to come unto, or hear, either in common churches, or private chappels, &c.) then is mentioned or set forth in the same book. Fifthly, "That all Priests and Deacons, shall be bound to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, except they be lett by preaching, studying of divinity, or some other urgent cause." And Sixthly, "That the Curate that ministreth in every Parish Church, or Chappel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably letted, shall say the same in the Parish Church or Chappel where he ministreth, and shall toll a bell

thereto at convenient time, before he begin, that such as are disposed, may come to hear God's word, and pray with him; so as in some cases it may be said of the Priest, as the Father doth of Christ, that he is, *os ipsum per quod loquimur*, the very mouth by which we speak unto our Father which is in heaven."

Heylin's Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 8.

As I have said before, the subject as to the clergyman's position during the prayers is one of very little importance. But since an outcry of Popery has been raised, because one clergyman in a new church has made his arrangements so as to be able to comply with this regulation of the church, it is as well to shew that in this kind of Popery our pious Reformers were very obstinate, and that in observing this ceremony, we should be following not only the Fathers of whom some persons seem to think that they can have done nothing right, but also the Reformers, whom the same persons regard as if they had been incapable of doing wrong. The action as a significative action might be useful. When men see the officiating minister comfortably supported by his cushions on his elevated pulpit, and from his easy position, to all appearance, reading to *them* instead of praying to *God*, many of them will naturally think that if cushions be not at hand on which to kneel, they may make themselves as comfortable as they can without kneeling, attending to the words he reads to them, if he reads well, and forgetting that he is engaged in the awful duty of prayer, if he reads ill.

Note P, p. 37.

READING DESK.

In the royal injunctions still in force (injunct. 22, Edw. VI. and 18 of Elizabeth, A.D. 1559) it is enjoined "that the Litany shall be sung or said in the middle of the Church, before the chancel door, at a LOW Desk," commonly called the fald-stool. It is so styled in the Coronation Service.

The use of the reading pew is itself peculiar to the English Church, and was introduced not by choice, but necessity. In the churches of the primitive Christians, it is true that the ambon, or *βημᾶ γνωστῶν*, is described as a reading desk, but it corresponds rather with our pulpit, and is called *pulpitum* by St. Cyprian. The prayers were offered in the chancel; the ambon was used for the reading of the epistles and gospels, and the presbyters preached from it. The bishop generally preached from the steps of the altar. St. Chrysostom appears to have been the first bishop who mounted the pulpit, perhaps owing to the inconvenient situation of the chancel at Constantinople. The singers also used to ascend the ambon when they took their part in the service. The origin of our reading pew, or reading desk, is given in Wheatley, and I shall transcribe his account. The first book of Edward VI. ordered "the priest, *being in the choir*, to begin the Lord's Prayer, called Pater-noster (with which the morning and evening service then began,) with a loud voice. So that

then it was the custom for the minister to perform divine service (i. e. the morning and evening prayer, as well as the communion office,) at the upper end of the choir, near the altar; *towards which, whether standing or kneeling, he always turned his face in the prayers:* though whilst he was reading the lessons he turned to the people. Against this, Bucer, *by the direction of Calvin*, most grievously declaimed, urging that 'it was a most Antichristian practice for the priest to say prayers only in the choir, as a place peculiar to the clergy, and not in the body of the church among the people, who had as much right to divine worship as the clergy themselves!' He, therefore, strenuously insisted that 'the reading divine service in the chancel was an insufferable abuse, and ought immediately to be amended, if the whole nation would not be guilty of high treason against God. This terrible outcry, however senseless and trifling, prevailed so far, that when the Common Prayer Book was altered in the 5th year of King Edward, the following rubric was placed in room of the old one: viz. 'the morning and evening prayers shall be used in such places of the church, chapel, or chancel, and the minister shall so turn him as the people may best hear. And if there be any controversy therein, the matter shall be referred to the ordinary, and he or his deputy shall appoint the place.' This alteration caused great contentions, some kneeling one way and some another, though still keeping in the chancel; while others left the

accustomed place, and performed all the services in the body of the church amongst the people. For the appeasing of this strife and diversity, it was thought fit, when the English service was again brought into the Church, at the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne, that the rubric should be corrected, and put into the same form in which we now have it, viz. that 'the morning and evening prayers shall be used in the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel'; by which, for the generality, must be meant the *choir or chancel*, which was the accustomed place before the second Prayer Book of King Edward. For it cannot be supposed that this second book, which lasted only one year and a half, could establish a custom. However, a dispensing power was left with the ordinary, who might determine it otherwise if he saw just cause. Pursuant to this rubric, the *morning and evening service was again, as formerly, read in the chancel or choir*. But because in some churches the too great distance of the chancel from the body of the church, occasioned sometimes by the interposition of a belfry, hindered the minister from being heard distinctly by the people, therefore the bishops, at the solicitations of the inferior clergy, allowed them in several places to supersede their former practice, and to have desks or reading pews in the body of the church, where they might, with more ease to themselves, and greater convenience to the people, perform the daily morning and evening service. Which

dispensation, begun first by some few ordinaries, and recommended by them to others, grew by degrees to be more general, till at last it came to be an universal practice; insomuch that the convocation, in the beginning of King James the First's reign, ordered that in every church there should be a convenient seat made for the minister to read service in."—*Wheatley on Common Prayer*, *p.* 113.

Such is the history of our reading desks. The chancels in the old churches were so inconvenient that the bishops *tolerated* the use of a reading pew. But in building new churches, our care, surely, ought to have been so to build the chancels, that such inconvenience should no longer exist, and that we might return to our proper place. And the fact is, that, in most of the new churches, the clergyman is better heard from the chancel than from the reading desk. Why then give us a second pulpit? why not send us back to the chancel? I believe that the answer will be found to be nothing more than that the papists, who still retain a portion of our Liturgy, officiate always at the altar, and that, consequently, we should be accused of symbolizing with Popery,—an argument as valid against the use of the Scripture.

Let it not be said that this is a subject of no importance. I have already remarked that, confined in a narrow box, the officiating minister cannot perform his various offices as he ought to do. With his face always turned to the people,—

most of the people listlessly lolling in their seats, seem to think he is reading to THEM. Our Liturgy (including under that designation the morning and evening service) is regarded as one long prayer, to be read by the clergyman, whereas it really consists of a great variety of services. If considered as one long prayer, such as dissenting teachers utter before they deliver their discourses, many faults may be found with our Prayer Book; but when regarded as a divine service of praise as well as of prayer, of exhortation on the part of the minister, and of acclamation on the part of the people, it is equally instructive and sublime. That it is, however, in fact, if not in theory, regarded as merely one long prayer, may be inferred from the circumstance, that we are accustomed to speak not of a clergyman's solemnizing divine service, but of his *reading prayers*. And, indeed, in the new rival pulpits a clergyman does appear rather to be *reading prayers* than *praying*.

NOTE Q. p. 37.

BOWING AT THE NAME OF JESUS.

The following is our 18th canon.

"*A Reverence and attention to be used in the Church in time of Divine Service.*

In the time of Divine Service, and of every part thereof, all due reverence is to be used; for it is according to the Apostle's rule, Let all things be done decently, and according to order; answerably to which decency and order, we judge these our directions following: No man shall cover his head in the Church

or Chapel, in the time of Divine Service, except he have some infirmity; in which case let him wear a night cap or coif. All manner of persons then present shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the General Confession, Litany, and other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Belief, according to the rules in that behalf prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer: *And likewise when in time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present as it hath been accustomed;* testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures, their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgement that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life, and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised. None, either man, woman, or child, of what calling soever, shall be otherwise at such times busied in the Church, than in quiet attendance, to hear, mark, and understand that which is read, preached, or ministered; saying in their due places audibly with the Minister, the Confession, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed; and making such other answers to the Public Prayers, as are appointed in the Book of Common Prayer: neither shall they disturb the Service or Sermon, by walking or talking, or any other way; nor depart out of Church during the time of Service or Sermon, without some urgent or reasonable cause."

So does the Church of England authoritatively decide, and that her decision is strictly in accordance with that of her Reformers is evident, because the Canon is based on the following Injunction, which our pious Reformers advised Queen Elizabeth to issue in this behalf:—

"Although Almighty God is all times to be honored with all manner of reverence that may be devised; yet of all other times in time of Common Prayer the same is to be most regarded. Therefore it is to be necessarily received that in time of the Litany, and all other Collects and Common Supplications to Almighty God, all manner of people shall devoutly and humbly kneel upon their knees and give ear thereunto, *and that whenso-*

ever the name of Jesus shall be in any Lesson, Sermon, or otherwise in the Church pronounced, that due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowness of courtesy and uncovering the heads of mankind," (alluding to sermons out of doors at Paul's Cross, &c.) "as thereunto doth necessarily belong and *heretofore hath been accustomed.*"

Injunctions by Queen Elizabeth, 1559.
Bp. Sparrow's Collections, 81.

To kneel in prayer, and to bow at the name of Jesus is not, therefore, Popish, unless our Martyr-Reformers were Papists.

Note R. p. 37.

CANDLES ON THE ALTAR.

"And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the Reign of Edward VI."—*Rubric in Common Prayer Book.*

Upon this Bishop Mant, in a note taken from Bishop Cosins and Wheatley, remarks:

As to the "ornaments of the Church," mentioned in this rubrick, it may be observed, that among others then in use, there were "two lights" injoined by the injunctions of King Edward the Sixth, which injunctions were also ratified by the Act of Uniformity that passed soon after the Reformation, to be set upon the Altar, as a significant ceremony to represent the light which Christ's Gospel brought into the world. And this, too, was ordered by the very same injunction which prohibited all other lights and tapers that used to be superstitiously set before images or shrines, &c. And these lights, used time out of mind in the Church, are still continued in most, if not all, Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Chapels, so often as divine service is performed by candle light; and ought also, by this rubrick, to be used in all Parish Churches and Chapels at the same times."

Some Clergymen have due regard for these ancient and decent ornaments of the altar, in the hope that they may lead the people to look with more reverence on the Sacrament of the altar, and excite a spirit of thankfulness for the glorious and heavenly light of which they are emblematical. They may be in error, but they can hardly be charged with Popery, except by those ultra-Protestants who regard the English Reformers, who inserted this rubric, as Papistical, and a true son of the Church of England will gladly bear the charge if it be applied equally to our Martyr-Reformers.

In spite of Dr. Faussett, *(pace tanti viri!)* I speak of the Communion table as an Altar, finding that it is repeatedly so spoken of in the coronation office, and thinking that the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his suffragans, who assisted in that august solemnity, are as capable of judging of what is Papistical as the Margaret professor. It appears from the following passage, that our great Reformers did not foresee the revival of Popery by the retention of this word.

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, they (the Reformers) called the Sacrament of the Altar, as appears plainly by the statute, 1 Edward VI., intituled 'an Act against such as speak unreverently against the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, commonly called the Sacrament of the ALTAR:' for which, consult the body of the Act itself; or, secondly, by Bishop Ridley, one of the chief compilers of the Common Prayer Book, who doth not only call it the Sacrament of the Altar, affirming thus, that *in the Sacrament of the Altar*, is the natural body and blood of Christ, &c., but in his reply to an argument of the Bishop of Lincoln, taken out of St. Cyril, he doth resolve it

thus; viz. 'The word altar in Scripture signifieth as well the altar whereon the Jews were wont to offer their burnt sacrifice as the table of the Lord's Supper; and that St. Cyril meaneth by this word altar, not the Jewish altar, but the table of the Lord, &c.' *Acts and Mon. part* 3, *p.* 492 *and* 497. Thirdly, by Bishop Latimer, his fellow martyr, who plainly grants 'that the Lord's table may be called an Altar, and that the Doctors called it so in many places, though there be no propitiatory sacrifice but only Christ,' *part* 2, *p.* 85. Fourthly, by several affirmations of John Lambert and John Philpot, two learned and religious men, whereof the one suffered death for religion, in the reign of Henry VIII., and the other in the fiery time of Queen Mary. This sacrament being called by both the Sacrament of the Altar, in their several times; for which consult the Acts and Monuments, commonly called the Book of Martyrs."

Heylin Cyprianus Anglicus, Pref.

Note S. p. 37.

CLERICAL HABILIMENTS.

In the advertisements of Queen Elizabeth, we find that our Reformers applied to the civil authority to enforce the regulation of the Church thus:—

"In the ministration of the Holy Communion in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the principal Minister shall use a *Cope* with Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably."

Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements.
Bp. Sparrow's Collection, p. 124.

And thus it is ordained in the 24th Canon:

"*Copes to be worn in Cathedral Churches by those that administer the Communion.* In all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the Holy Communion shall be administered upon principal feast days, sometimes by the Bishop, if he be present, and sometimes by the Dean, and at sometimes by a Canon or Prebendary, *the principle Minister using a decent Cope*, and being assisted with the Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably, according to the advertisements published Anno. 7 Eliz."

The use of the cope would doubtless now be considered "flat Popery,"—why more so than that of the surplice, it is difficult to say. Both were placed under the same category in the days of our Reformers, and the surplice equally with the cope was declared to be "a patch of papistry." *Strype's Parker*, i. 330. Our Reformers contended for and insisted on the use of both,—"the cope in the ministration of the Lord's Supper, and the surplice in all other ministrations."—*Strype's Annals*, i. *pt.* i. *p.* 320. When these habits fell into disuse I know not, but so late as the year 1681, we find the following entry in Thoresby's Diary, Thoresby being then a Non-conformist, "Die Dom. In the forenoon went to the Minster (Durham); was somewhat amazed at their ornaments, *tapers, rich embroidered copes*, vestments, &c."—*Diary*, i. 75. I need scarcely remark that if in other Minsters and Cathedrals this canon is transgressed, it was strictly observed at Westminster by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the officiating Bishops, and the Prebendaries, at the coronation. Why they should offend against the canon by not using their copes, on ordinary occasions, it is difficult to say, for it cannot be more popish or superstitious to use it at one time than at another. But my object in alluding to the circumstance is not to advocate the revival of what might offend weaker brethren, but to shew that a due attention to the decent and orderly ceremonies of the sanctuary, as it is, certainly, not

unscriptural, so it is strictly in accordance with the principles and practice of our Church and her Reformers.

The mention of Durham reminds me of a transaction which occurred with respect to that Cathedral in the reign of Charles I, so very like what is almost daily occurring in our own times, that I will extract the account given of it by Collier, as it will at the same time let the reader see what ceremonies were in use before the great Rebellion. The exaggerations in the charges made against the Dean of Peterborough are such that one might almost suppose oneself to be reading a paragraph in some popular *religious* newspaper of the day.

"One *Smart*, a Prebendary of *Durham*, complained to the parliament, against Dr. *Cosins*, Prebendary of the same Church, and Dean of *Peterborough*. *Cosins* was charged with superstition and illegal proceedings against the complainant. The Articles of Superstition suggested that *Cosins* set up a marble altar, with *cherubins*, in the Cathedral of *Durham!* That this, with the appurtenances, cost two thousand pounds. That this ornamental furniture, which he calls appurtenances, was a cope, the representation of the Trinity, and God the Father in the figure of an old man. There was likewise said to be a crucifix, with a red beard and blue cap. The Dean was further accused for lighting two hundred wax candles about the altar on *Candlemas-day*; for forbidding the singing of any psalms before and after sermons; for making an anthem to be sung of the *Three Kings of Cologne*, *Gaspar*, *Balthazar*, and *Melchior*; and for procuring a consecrated knife, only to cut the bread at the communion. That *Smart*, above mentioned, declaimed with some vehemence in the pulpit against these innovations. *His text was, I hate all those that hold of superstitious vanities, but thy law do I love.* That for this freedom he was imprisoned by the High *Commission at York*, and kept under durance four months, before any articles

were exhibited against him. That from hence he was removed to the High *Commission* at *Lambeth;* and that after having been harass'd a long time, he was remanded to *York*, fined five hundred pounds, committed, and ordered to recant; and that refusing to make this submission, he was further fined, excommunicated, degraded, and deprived. This complaint formed into a *bill*, was laid before the House of Commons, and afterwards carried up to the House of Lords. That *Smart* was called the *Proto-Martyr* of *England, in these later days of persecution* by *Rouse* who carried up the *Bill* to the Lords, and that a large reparation was made to the complainant. Thus far *Fuller*. But that this *Historian* was mis-informed, appears by his own letter to Dr. *Cosins*, in which he owns his mistake, and promised to make the Dean satisfaction in his next *print*.

"I shall give the *Reader* matter of fact from Dr. *Cosins* his letter upon this subject. To be brief. When *Smart's Bill* of complaint was carried up by *Rouse*, a Member of the Commons, to the House of Lords, *Cosins* put in full answer upon oath: That his answer was entered upon the rolls of Parliament, made good before the Lords, both by himself, and by the very witness that *Smart* and his son-in-law produced against him. That upon this, *Glover*, *Smart's* Lawyer, told him at the Bar of the House of Lords, he was ashamed of his complaint, and could in conscience plead no longer for him: That after this the cause came on no more: That many of the Lords declared publickly that *Smart* has abused the House of Commons with a groundless complaint against *Cosins:* And that by an order from the Lords delivered to him by the Earl of *Warwick*, he had the liberty to go where he pleased, and never heard any more from them. The answer *Cosins* gave in upon oath, and made good before the Lords, was to this effect:

"(1st.) That the Communion Table in the Church of *Durham*, which the *Bill* of Complaint calls the Marble Altar, with Cherubins, was not set up by *Cosins*, but by the Dean and Chapter many years before he was Prebendary of that Church: And that *Smart* was then one of that *Chapter*. (2ndly.) That by the publick accounts standing upon the Register, the charge did not amount to above the tenth part of what was pretended. (3rdly.) That the *Copes* used in that Church were furnished long before *Cosins* his time: And that *Smart*, the complainant was Prebend-

ary when they were bought, and allowed his share of the charge. (4thly.) That Cosins never approved the Picture of the Trinity, or the Image of God the Father, in any figure: And that to his knowledge there was no such representation in the Church of Durham. (5thly.) That the *Crucifix*, with a Blue Cap, and a Golden Beard, mentioned in the Bill of Complaint, was nothing but the Top of Bishop *Hatfield's* Tomb, which had stood in the Church above two hundred and fifty years: and that there was no such figure upon any of the Copes, as is reported in *Fuller's* History. (6thly.) That by the Statutes of that Church, to which *Smart* was sworn no less than *Cosins;* by these local statutes, the treasurer was to provide a sufficient number of wax lights for the service of the quire during the winter season. That there was never above two fair candles set upon the Communion Table. That there is no more candles used upon a *Candlemas night*, than in the *Christmas Holydays:* And that the number of them was lessen'd or increased in proportion to the congregation. (7thly.) That *Cosins* never forbad singing the *Metre*-Psalms in the Church, but us'd to sing them himself with the people at Morning Prayer. (8thly.) That he was so far from directing the singing an *Anthem* to the three Kings of *Cologne*, that at his first coming to *Durham* Cathedral he ordered this superstitious hymn to be cut out of the Old Song Books belonging to the *Choristers* School. That no such anthem had been sung in the choir during his being there, nor so far as his enquiry could reach for three score years before, and upwards. (9thly.) That the Knife used for cutting the Bread at the Communion was never consecrated. (10thly.) That in *Smart's* Sermon there are several propositions, not to be reconciled either to the Laws of God, or his Church, or the *Statutes* of the realm. That *Cosins* reported some of these passages, and appeal'd to the Lords for the justice of the censure pass'd upon him. And lastly, that the complainant had swelled the account of what he suffer'd; that he never paid his fine, that the value of his church preferments, lost by his obstinacy, was over and above made good to him by the contributions he received upon the score of his lying under censure. But that the Parliament gave him no damages, nor ordered *Cosins*, or any other person *Smart* complained of, to pay him a farthing by way of reparation."

Collier, ii. 798.

It is, indeed, very evident to the student of ecclesiastical history, that there were many ceremonies, of which there was a traditional observance in the Church, though enforced by no rubrical directions, from the period of the reformation to that of the rebellion, which, because merely traditional observances, could not be revived at the restoration, the ceremonies of the Church having been suspended for so many years. I do not know that the revival of them was to be desired, but I am only speaking of the fact. For instance, at the Hampton Court Conference, the Bishop of Winton alludes to certain common practices, such as "kneeling on the ground, *and lifting up of our hands, the knocking of our breasts,*" which he says are "ceremonies significant, the first of our humility coming before the mighty God; the second of our confidence and hope; the other of our sorrow and detestation of our sins."—*Phenix*, i. 165. When young Prince Charles was going to Madrid, the decencies of religion were carefully attended to, and the directions given to the chaplains, even at a time when Abbot was Archbishop, who was inclined to Puritanism, were as follows:—

"1. That there be one convenient room appointed for prayer, the said room to be employed, during their abode, to no other use.

"2. That it be decently adorned Chapel-wise, with an Altar, Fonts, Palls, Linen Coverings, Demy-Carpets, Four Surplices, Candlesticks, Tapers, Chalices, Pattens, a fine Towel for the Prince, other Towels for the Household, a Traverse of Waters for the Communion, a Bason and Flaggons, two Copes.

"3. That Prayers be duly kept twice a day. That all reverence be used by every one present, being uncovered, kneeling at due times, standing up at the Creeds and Gospel, bowing at the name of Jesus.

"4. That the Communion be celebrated in due form, with an oblation of every communicant, and admixing water with the wine, the Communion to be as often used as it shall please the Prince to set down: smooth wafers to be used for the Bread.

"5. That in the Sermons there be no polemical preachings to inveigh against them, or to confute them, but only to confirm the doctrine and tenets of the Church of England by all possible arguments either in fundamental or moral points; and especially to apply themselves in moral lessons to preach Christ Jesus crucify'd.

"6. That they give no occasions (or rashly entertain any) of conference or dispute, (for fear of dishonour to the Prince, if upon any offence taken, he should be required to send away one of them:) But if the Lord Ambassador or Mr. Secretary wish them to hear any that desire some information, then they may safely do it.

"7. That they carry the Articles of our Religion in many copies, the Books of Common Prayer in several languages, store of English Service Books, &c."

Collier, ii. 726.

I merely quote this passage in confirmation of what I have said, that there were many traditional observances received from our Reformers, which, after the restoration, fell into disuse. It is certain that if a young prince were in these days to go into foreign parts, no such directions for divine worship among his household would be given, and perhaps some may think that such splendour is better omitted. There is no doubt but that attention to outward circumstances may often render men mere formalists. And it is lamentable when such is the case. But sometimes, too, it happens, that,

by the neglect of externals, principles are themselves forgotten. It is not quite certain in these days whether if a young prince went abroad, he would be attended by any chaplain, or be directed to worship God at all. Neither the English Reformers nor the Lutherans, (the Protestants strictly so called,) were hostile to the ancient ceremonies, or to the ancient ornaments of the Church. Of the Lutherans it has been remarked, "that all their Churches, and especially their Cathedrals, are not to be distinguished from many in the midst of Rome, on account of their various paintings, exalted crucifixes, and frequent images. All veneration, however, is absolutely forbidden to be paid to them, which they strictly observe, though they own that they look upon them as convenient for notices and remembrances of our Saviour's Passion, and of the devotions of his Saints; and, in short, use them no otherwise than we do our prints and pictures, in our Bibles and Common Prayer Books."—*Northleigh's Topogr. Descript. p.* 128. It is, indeed, notorious, that although the mob, at our Reformation, instigated by religious demagogues, did much injury to our Churches, the images of the saints were removed from them *not* by our English Reformers, but by Cromwell and his partizans. This sort of fanaticism is to be traced entirely to the Calvinists, Anabaptists, and sectaries of that class. "It is a matter of fact," saith a late ingenious author, "that crosses and pictures of our Saviour were left standing, when

there was no such apparent hazard of their being abused; as appears from the paintings of our windows in many of our Churches. We are not against the historical use, but the idolatrous abuse of images."—*Britons no converts to Popery.* Even at the present time, in many Lutheran Churches candles are lighted, and a crucifix placed, on the altar. Queen Elizabeth retained a silver crucifix on the Communion table, in her chapel, until, at the instigation of Sir Francis Knollys, it was broken by Peach, her fool. Against her retention of this ornament, several of our Reformers, in my opinion wisely, protested. The use of the crucifix is not of ancient date, and it is very easily abused to the purposes of superstition; I am glad, therefore, that we are well rid of it,—but this was not entirely effected before the great Rebellion. Archbishop Williams was the bitter opponent of Laud, and yet of his chapel we find the following description:— "Besides his altar, most richly furnished, there are to be seen goodly pictures, which cannot but strike the beholders with thoughts of piety and devotion at their entrance; as the picture of the Passion, and likewise of the Holy Apostles, together with a fair crucifix set up in painted glass, in the East window, just over the holy table."—*Pocklington's Altar, Christ. p.* 83. To these facts I simply refer to shew that when men in these days declaim against, not the erection of a *crucifix*, but even the ornament of a *cross*, as proofs of a spirit hostile to that of our Reformers, and of

an inclination to Popery, they speak in utter ignorance of history. All these things may be wrong, and let them so be proved, but against them the authority of our Reformers cannot be quoted,—no—nor even that of the Lutheran Reformers.

Note T, p. 42.

The 53rd Canon runs thus:

"If any preacher shall, in the pulpit particularly, or namely of purpose, impugn or confute any doctrine delivered by any other preacher in the same Church, or in any Church near adjoining, before he hath acquainted the Bishop of the Diocese therewith, and received order from him what to do in that case, because upon such public dissenting and contradicting there may grow much offence and disquietness unto the people; the churchwardens or party grieved, shall forthwith signify the same to the said Bishop, and not suffer the said preacher any more to occupy that place which he hath once abused, except he faithfully promise to forbear all such matter of contention in the Church, until the Bishop hath taken further order therein; who shall with all convenient speed so proceed therein, that public satisfaction may be made in the congregation where the offence was given. Provided, that if either of the parties offending do appeal he shall not be suffered to preach *pendente lite*."

Of all the glaring violations of this canon, none is, of course, so conspicuous as that which has lately been exhibited by the Rev. Dr. Faussett. What may be the merits of Dr. Faussett in the Lecture-room I have no means of knowing, but, certainly, his example in this instance must be at variance with the precepts of obedience to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the canons which we

may, in charity, suppose that he inculcates upon his pupils. The present discourse is sufficient to shew that I am not, any more than Dr. Faussett, inclined to approve of Mr. Frowde's Remains. I deeply, indeed, regret the publication of that work without a protest, on the part of the Editor, against the author's many paradoxical positions. With a kind heart and glowing sensibilities, Mr. Frowde united a mind of wonderful power, saturated with learning, and, from its very luxuriance, productive of weeds together with many flowers. Though he always took an original, he sometimes took a morbid view of things, and while from his writings all must derive much food for thought, from many of his opinions the majority of his readers will, like myself, dissent. If, in contemplating the evils inseparable from a great movement, he does not sufficiently appreciate, and I think he does not, the wisdom of our Reformation, or the virtues of many of our Reformers; if while condemning the *Romish* he censures the *English* Church, we may think him to be in error in these particulars, without condemning him by wholesale,—still less ought those persons to condemn him for not fully appreciating our Reformation, who, like Mr. Scott, consider the work of the Reformers, in retaining our present baptismal service, "a burthen hard to bear," "an absurdity which they did not believe in their hearts." Had Dr Faussett contented himself

with writing a pamphlet or a review, while we might have considered him incompetent to sit in judgment on such a mind as Mr. Frowde's, we should have had no cause of complaint. But cause of complaint the Church has when he makes one work a pretext for attacking certain of his clerical brethren, whose learning he may be unable to appreciate, but whose piety and zeal he would do well to imitate; when he uses the pulpit to compel that attention to himself which he could not secure from the press; and when to give a zest to his declamation, he purposely "impugns and refutes," (or rather attempts to do so) the doctrine which he knows to be preached in the very pulpit in which he takes the bold measure of instructing the young Oxonians how best to transgress the canons of the Church. If Dr. Faussett has a right on one Sunday to attack his brethren in the ministry, than whom he is not himself, one whit more infallible, the brethren thus attacked might, Sunday after Sunday, ascend the pulpit and assail Dr. Faussett and his projected new Oxford school of divinity. If, with equal indiscretion and no greater regard for the regulations of the Church, they had done so, if deducing their own conclusions from Dr. Faussett's manifest opposition to fastings and mortifications of the flesh, they had headed their discourses with the taking title, "Revival of Sensualism," just as he has charged them with "The Revival of Popery," Dr. Faussett would, indeed, have had no just

ground for complaint, but the Church would have had to deplore an exhibition the most disgraceful, though the natural consequence of Dr. Faussett's conduct. To the discretion of the parties attacked, to their Christian forbearance, to that "High Churchism" which ensures their deference to the principles of the Church of England, we are deeply indebted, and their forbearance will speak more eloquently in their favour than all the words of Dr. Faussett in their dispraise.*

In concluding these notes I wish to observe that my intention has not been to bring charges against those who may differ from me in opinion, and yet are united with me in a desire to adhere to the principles of the Church. But I

* After the above note was written and sent to the press, the Bishop of Oxford's Charge was published. The Bishop of Oxford had a right to do what Dr. Faussett had no right to do: his Lordship had a right to pronounce sentence, ex cathedra, after examination, on the conduct and doctrines of his clergy, among whom are the writers of the Oxford Tracts. And his Lordship's sentence has been given in the following words: "I have spoken of *increased exertions* among us, and of an increasing sense of our Christian responsibilities; and therefore you will probably expect that I should say something of that peculiar developement of religious feeling in one part of the diocese, of which so much has been said, and which has been *supposed* to *tend* immediately to a revival of several of the errors of Romanism. In point of fact, I have been continually, though anonymously, appealed to, in my official capacity, to check breaches both of doctrine and discipline through the growth of Popery among us.

"Now, as regards the latter point, breaches of discipline namely, on points connected with the public service of the Church, I really am unable, *after diligent enquiry, to find any thing which can be so interpreted.* I am given to understand, that an injudicious attempt was made *in one instance*, to adopt some forgotten portion of the ancient clerical

have been desirous of pointing out the erroneous position in which we are at present placed by those who would divide us into High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen. I have shewn that the English Reformers contended for the principles,

dress; but I believe it was speedily abandoned, and do not think it likely we shall hear of a repetition of this, or similar Indiscretions. *At the same time, so much of what has been objected to, has arisen from minute attention to the Rubric; and I esteem uniformity so highly (and uniformity never can be obtained without strict attention to the Rubric,) that I confess I would rather follow an antiquated custom (even were it so designated)* WITH *the Rubric, than be entangled in the modern confusions which ensue from the neglect of it.*"—*p.* 19, 20.

It is hoped that, from a sense of justice and from a recollection of who is the Father of Lies, this contradiction on the highest authority, will be immediately published in those periodicals, which gave circulation, a short time ago, to the most preposterous falsehoods against these pious men whose exertions are thus praised by their Bishop. And now for their doctrine: "With reference to errors in doctrine, which has been imputed to the series of publications, called, *The Tracts for the Times*, it can hardly be expected that, on occasions like the present, I should enter into, or give a handle to, any thing which might hereafter tend to controversial discussions. Into controversy I will not enter. But, generally speaking, I may say, that in these days of lax and spurious liberality, any thing which tends to recall forgotten truths, is *valuable:* and where these publications have directed men's minds to such important subjects as the union, the discipline, and the authority of the Church, I think they have done good service: but there may be some points in which, perhaps, from ambiguity of expression, or similar causes, it is not impossible, but that evil rather than the intended good, may be produced on minds of a peculiar temperament. I have more fear of the disciples than of the teachers. In speaking therefore of the Authors of the Tracts in question, I would say, that I think their desire to restore the ancient discipline of the Church most praiseworthy; I rejoice in their attempts to secure a stricter attention to the Rubrical directions in the Book of Common Prayer; and I heartily approve the spirit which would restore a due observance of the Fasts and Festivals of the Church."—*p.* 20, 21.

Here is the sentence of their Diocesan officially recorded. The Bishop thinks it right to add his opinion and advice, which is given in that truly paternal spirit which dictated the charge, and which has always distinguished the conduct of the Bishop of Oxford: "*but*" adds his Lordship, "I would implore them, by the purity of their intentions, to be cautious, both in their writings and actions, to take *heed lest their good be evil spoken of;* lest in their exertions to re-establish unity, they unhappily create fresh schism; lest in their admiration of antiquity,

and resolutely maintained the practices, for defending and maintaining which, those who are now styled High-Churchmen are assailed as Papists. If *they*, then, were to assail their opponents as persons hostile to the spirit and principles of the English Reformation, as persons who, with respect to baptism especially, are wont to use a language which they acknowledge to be different from the language of the prayer book, however much we might regret the circumstance, it would not be a matter of much surprise to any one. But it is notorious that such, at the present time, is not the case. Those who are called Low-Churchmen are the assailants, and in assailing High-Churchmen, they are in fact assailing our high-church Reformers, and fighting the battle against them in favour of their old enemies, the Puritans. Surely, then, it is not much to ask, for the sake of peace, that if those who are on the strong side refrain

they revert to practices which heretofore have ended in superstition." By some persons this last sentence, which expresses the sentiment of many who approve of the Tracts *in general*, though they dissent from them in some *particulars*, has been construed into a *censure* on *the Tracts for the Times*, which would be, in fact, to make the Bishop stultify himself: his Lordship, therefore appends a note to state that such "never was his intention," and he concludes with asserting the very principles advocated in the present discourse: "There must always be allowable points of difference in the opinions of good men, and it is only where such opinions are carried into extremes, or are mooted in a spirit which tends to schism, that the interference of those in authority in the Church is called for. *The authors of the Tracts in question have laid no such painful necessity on me, nor have I to fear that they will ever do so.* I have the best reasons for knowing, that they would be the first to submit themselves to that authority which it has been their constant exertion to uphold and defend. And I feel sure, that they will receive my friendly suggestions in the spirit in which I have here offered them."

from attacking: those who are, confessedly, so far as the Church and the *English* Reformers are concerned, on the weak side, should be equally forbearing. There are among them many pious and good men, whose only fault is that they take, without examination, the premises afforded them in the falsehoods invented by certain newspapers and magazines, and then hastily draw conclusions which would not be false, were the premises correct; but with whom are these persons uniting in order to defame the representatives of our very High-Church Reformers? Let them look to the cold, worldly theologians, who are seeking to inflame their passions, merely to further the party purposes of worldly policy. I will not name them. But it is notorious that against those whom they are pleased to denominate High-Churchmen, are joined in one band the most cold and calculating of our divines, who regard the Church as little more than a state engine, together with others, whose truly evangelical views ought to unite them with the very men to whom they are opposed, even though on some points of opinion they may differ. With respect to such combinations, we may truly say with an old writer, "if such public mischiefs be presaged by astrologers from the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, though the first of these be a planet of most sweet and gentle influence, what dangers, what calamities, may not be feared from these political conjunctions!"

For my part, I hate party names, which often make a distinction between persons where there is no difference. I believe that, in real principle, a more united body of men never existed than the Clergy of England at the present time, and the attempt to make them suppose themselves at variance cannot certainly be of God. But if men *will* divide us—be it so. And if I am ranked among the High-Churchmen, I shall be perfectly contented. I am content to be what the Fathers of the Church Universal were; I am content to be what our pious Reformers were; and if the opprobrious epithets which were applied to them be applied to us, we shall glory in the tribulation, and rejoice to bear the scandal of the cross. Only let it be clearly understood what a High-Churchman, according to the present signification of the term is; let it be understood that while the Low-Churchman is contending for the *temporalities* of an *Establishment*, the High-Churchman regards only the *spiritualities* of the *Church*; that while the Low-Churchman is a High-Establishment man, the High-Churchman is prepared to sacrifice all the advantages of an Establishment, rather than compromise an iota of God's truth; that while the Low-Churchman defers to acts of the English*

* Our's is sometimes, wickedly, called by the Papists "An Act of Parliament Church," and it is to be feared that the principles of some High-Establishment men and Low-Churchmen, in this respect, assist the cause of Popery. Not long ago, I saw the announcement of a sermon to be preached in a Church in behalf of the Moravian missions. The preacher seems to have had some little doubt in his mind whether

Parliament, the High-Churchman defers to the Church in Council; that while the Low-Churchman interprets Scripture according to the tradition of men,—a tradition which can be traced back only to a Calvin or an Arminius, the High-Churchman interprets Scripture according to the system which may be traced back to the Apostles themselves, and which the Church Universal has regarded

he could, consistently, plead, in Church, the cause of a dissenting Institution, and certainly, in doing so, he violated the canons of the Church of England But to satisfy his own mind, and to anticipate objections, he stated in the advertisement that "the Moravians are declared *by Act of Parliament* to be a true Protestant Episcopal Church!" It would not be to Acts of Parliament that a High-Churchman would refer on such a subject, but to the Gospel. And certainly the Irish members will rejoice to find that the Parliament, in which they have such influence, is invested, in the opinions of some Protestants, with authority to decide on what are, or are not, true Protestant Episcopal Churches. They will, perhaps, wonder to find the English Parliament invested with a power similar to that which is exercised by the Pope, and will wonder the more at finding those persons who thus defer, in ecclesiastical matters, to Parliament, complaining, when Parliament taxes us to support the College at Maynooth, and constitutes the Romish Church as the *Established* Church of Canada. But supposing, for the sake of argument, that an Act of Parliament is, in matters ecclesiastical, an infallible authority, and that the respectable society of the Moravians is "a true Protestant Episcopal Church,"—still this does not prove that it is entitled to the support of Churchmen; for this "true Protestant Episcopal Church" may be here in England in a state of schism, and it is in a state of schism if it sets up altar against altar. If it be pretended that the Moravians, because pronounced by an Act of Parliament to be a true Protestant Episcopal Church, do not essentially differ from us, that very circumstance only renders their schism the more unjustifiable. And a Scriptural Christian, or High-Churchman, will fear to handle the word of God deceitfully, or to speak of schism, as anything but a sin. It is not with any feeling of unkindness towards the quiet and respectable denomination of Moravians that I write thus, I would only refer them, not to Acts of Parliament, but to the unadulterated Scriptures, where they will find that as there is one *Spirit*, so also there is one *body*. I would refer them to *John* xvii. 21, 23; to 1 *Cor.* i. 10, 13; *Col.* iii. 15; *Ephes.* iv. 4; and to Churchmen I must add *Rom.* xvi. 17.

as, in its origin, divine; in short let me conclude with the words of Bishop Horsley:—

"Upon these topics", says that great divine, alluding to the Apostolical Succession, &c., "the clergy of late years have been more silent than is perfectly consistent with their duty, from a fear, as I conceive, of acquiring the name and reputation of High Churchmen. But, my brethren, you will not be scared from your duty by the idle terror of a mere name, artfully applied in violation of the true meaning of the word to entrap the judgment of the many, and bring the discredit of a folly long since eradicated, upon principles which have no connexion with it. You promote the stratagem of your enemies, you are assisting in the fraud upon the public, and you are accessaries to the injury to yourselves, if you give way to a dread of the imputation. To be a High Churchman, in the only sense which the word can be allowed to bear, as applicable to any in the present day, God forbid that this should ever cease to be my public pretension, my pride, my glory! To be a High Churchman in the true import in the English language, God forbid that ever I should deserve the imputation. A High Churchman in the true sense of the word, is one that is a bigot to the *secular* rights of the Priesthood; one who claims for the Hierarchy, upon pretence of a right inherent in the sacred office, all those powers, honours, and emoluments, which they enjoy under an establishment; which are held indeed by no other tenure, than at the will of the Prince, or by the law of the land. To the Prince, or to the law, we acknowledge ourselves indebted for all our secular possessions; for the rank and dignity annexed to the superior order of the clergy; for our secular authority; for the jurisdiction of our courts, and for every civil effect which follows the exercise of our spiritual authority. All these rights and honours with which the priesthood is adorned by the piety of the civil magistrate, are quite distinct from the spiritual commission which we bear for the administration of our Lord's proper Kingdom. They have no necessary connexion with it; they stand merely on the ground of human law, and vary, like the rights of other citizens, as the laws which create them vary. And in every Church, connected, like our Church, with the state by an establishment, even spiritual authority cannot be conferred without the consent of the

supreme civil Magistrate. But in the language of our modern sectaries, every one is a High-Churchman, who is not unwilling to recognise so much as the spiritual authority of the Priesthood; every one, who denying what we ourselves disclaim, any thing of a divine right to temporalities, acknowledges, however, in the sacred character, somewhat more divine than may belong to the mere hired servants of the state, or of the laity, and regards the service, which we are thought to perform for our pay, as something more than a part to be gravely played in the drama of human politics. My reverend brethren, we must be content to be High-Churchmen according to this usage of the word, or we cannot at all be Churchmen. For he who thinks of God's ministers as the mere servants of the state, is out of the Church, —severed from it by a kind of self-excommunication. Much charitable allowance is to be made for the errors of the laity upon points to which it is hardly to be expected they should turn their attention of their own accord, and upon which, for some time past, they have been very imperfectly instructed. Dissenters are to be judged with much candour, and with every possible allowance for the prejudices of education. But for those who have been nurtured in the bosom of the Church, and have gained admission to the ministry, if from a mean compliance with the humour of the age, or ambitious of the fame of *liberality of sentiment* (for under a specious name, a profane indifference is made to pass for an accomplishment) they affect to join in the disavowal of the authority which they share, or are silent when the validity of their divine commission is called in question; for any, I hope they are few, who hide this weakness of faith, this poverty of religious principle, under the attire of a gown and cassock, they are, in my estimation, little better than infidels in masquerade."

Bp. Horsley's Charge to the Clergy of St. David's, in the year 1709, *p.* 34, 37.

R. PERRING, PRINTER, LEEDS.